The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE heart-rending tragedy of the ruthless suppression of the Hungarian rising, followed by the deportation of thousands of young men to Russia, the exodus of thousands of refugees, and what accompanying punishments and horrors that are only to be guessed at, has shown within what narrow limits the writ of U.N.O. runs. Even the humble request to send neutral observers is, as we write, still refused. Meantime Mr. Eisenhower washes his hands, and Mr. Nehru accepts the explanation " Mr. Bulganin has been good enough to send me " (*sic*) that Russian troops went in at the invitation of the Hungarian Government. The rising and what has gone with it is thus outside the competence of the United Nations, who have however passed some resolutions about it. There are some signs that liberal opinion in India is less easily satisfied than Mr. Nehru, who has now unfitted himself for the position of global adjudicator which he has latterly assumed. Some observers believe that the monolithic structure of Russian imperialism shows signs of cracking. It may be so. Men have always fought for freedom and always will. We salute those who have fallen, who have left no memorial and are perished as though they had never been, and add our own to the seas of useless tears that have been shed in Eastern Europe in these latter years. Oh Lord, how long. . . . ?

* * *

The crisis in the Middle East is another chapter, still in the writing, of the grim story of Russian imperialistic expansion on the perimeter of the vast empire that has expanded more rapidly than any empire in history. " Things go well for us," said Mr. Krushev recently : " if there were a God we would thank Him."

The Communist pressure, checked in Korea by America under the aegis of U.N. (owing to the temporary absence from the Security Council of Russia), and in Iran more easily by Britain, now challenges the West again. Britain and France have done the world two great services : they have brought to light the Communist infiltration of the Arab countries, and they have roused U.N.O. to action, after endless useless discussion, and after Egypt, which has been in a state of " continuous belligerency " with Israel for six years and has ignored the Security Council's order to cease denying to Israeli shipping

the passage of the Canal. (It is said that the Arab-Israel conflict has been on various agendas of U.N. more than 200 times without effect.) Now it becomes more and more evident that the British and French governments acted not a moment too soon in checking the Egyptian dictator who, himself negligible, had become yet another satellite of Russia, with immense power to harm the whole of Europe. It is not difficult to see where the fourth attempt will be made in due season to dominate Asia and threaten Africa.

* * *

Baldwin once said that the democracies were always two years too late. The storm of criticism, abuse and invective that has burst upon the British Government as the result of its action to keep the Canal open shows why. We may live to be grateful for a government that was strong enough and bold enough to take action which two years later—or one year—might well have been impossible. Its vindication is already beginning to appear, and the beating of breasts and the rending of garments in Parliament, in many Church circles, and in some parts of the Press are being seen to have been ill-informed and ill-advised. Two years hence an Arab confederacy led by Nasser, supplied and directed by Russia might very well have been as untouchable as Hungary.

* * *

It is said that Britain and France violated the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter is a document of considerable complexity and not always easy of interpretation ; but what is more important than the Charter, or even U.N.O. itself, are the ends which both attempt to serve. There are dangerous and inhumane situations that U.N.O. cannot deal with, like Hungary ; given the excuse that Russian intervention has been invited by a sovereign government, U.N.O. is helpless—and that is the situation that would inevitably have occurred in the oil-fields and the Canal. And there is the situation which is created when ' volunteers,' organized and supplied by the countries of their origin, make intervention actual, legal, and disastrous. Such volunteers from Russia were invited by Nasser to supplement the technicians and others, who fled to the Sudan and had to be flown back to Russia by Western aircraft.

The insistence upon uncertain legality in an international situation of such complexity and danger is as remote from reality as was the legalism of the Pharisees, who paid their tithes of mint, anise and cummin and omitted the weightier

matters of the law. Law is authoritative when it is accepted by those to whom it applies or when it can be enforced. These conditions do not apply in the situation in the Near East.

* * *

It can, of course, be agreed that the freedom of the Canal is a major British interest ; but it is not an exclusive interest. We do not ask for the Canal for ourselves but for the world's shipping. Is that an ignoble aim ? What have the critics of Britain and France to advance to support Egyptian exclusive control of a canal they did not build, do not use and cannot maintain or improve, if control gives the right to deny it (as to Israel), and even to destroy it ?

Nasser is a young man : he is a dictator who need feel careful of no one except military adventurers like himself. He was taken to a high place and shown the glories of an Arab Confederacy stretching from Syria to the Atlantic, enriched by vast resources of oil and having a stranglehold on the whole of the West, able to outflank the N.A.T.O. line of the defence of Europe and expose the whole of southern Europe. The price he had already begun to pay was subservience to Russia ; the price Russia had begun to pay was a few tanks and aircraft to eliminate Israel. The immediate issue was admittedly the freedom of the Canal, but the real issue was, and is, the defence of the whole Western world. The action of the Government has exposed the realities of the situation. They deserve, and shortly, we believe, will receive our thanks, and the thanks of the whole free world.

* * *

We hope that when these notes are read not only will opinion in this country have become calmer, but that some progress will have been made towards repairing the disunity in the democratic coalition. This has been a disconcerting factor in the situation for some time, and made action by France and Britain necessary. Though it is curious now to remember that it was the American refusal to proceed with the financing of the Aswam High Dam which was the match that started the flame, it was useless for the British and French governments to consult or inform the American government, then engaged in its election, of action of which they knew the Americans would disapprove. But the disunity is serious and ought to be unnecessary. (How can 70 nations in U.N.O. be expected to agree on anything important if three allies, like Britain, France and U.S.A., cannot ?)

* * *

The Yale Review for September, that is of course long before the Suez crisis broke, has an article, "Strategy versus Ideology" in which Mr. Louis J. Halle, formerly of the Policy Planning staff of the U.S. Department of State examines this disunity, which to so great an extent neutralizes the western advantages of greater material resources and the great strength of a long tradition of humane civilization. This disunity is due, Mr. Halle holds, not to the occasional differences between the governments, but to the disunity within each of our several national societies. It becomes political from time to time because it exists philosophically all the time.

* * *

We have often observed in these notes that when policy develops into action we, as Christians and churchmen, cannot intervene with any hope of success. Present-day statesmen do not change their declared policies at the behest of the bishops or the Free Church Federal Council, or even the World Council of Churches. Two recent examples may be recalled : the protest of the General Secretary of the World Council over the banishment of Archbishop Makarios before it became generally known that the Archbishop was deeply involved in the terrorist movement and was aware of the importation into Cyprus of terrorists from Greece, and the deputation from the British Council of Churches to Lord Kilmuir, acting for the Prime Minister, about Suez. But the important point is that we ought not to want to intervene. Our concern is with what people believe and think, and not with what they do. It is true, of course, that we are often involved as citizens who are Christians, and if we are wiser or better informed or more sensitive than our fellows we may influence them, but not as bishops or as ministers. There are indeed Christians who are statesmen, and statesmen who are, say, Moslems or Hindus, and there may be, as we have unhappily seen, clerics who are terrorists. We hope that our insight into the redeeming purpose of God will make us better men, better doctors, better shopkeepers, better miners, better factory workers, or better statesmen, but we do not necessarily carry over into technical activities our spiritual gifts. Did not a political opponent of Gladstone once say that he did not object to the G.O.M. having an ace up his sleeve : what he objected to was Gladstone's belief that the Almighty put it there ! And did not William Temple say that if he were drowning, he would rather see on the river bank an atheist who could swim than a bishop who couldn't ? To attempt to carry sacerdotal or ministerial authority into the complications of foreign politics always

fails, and ought to fail. Though, we repeat, we are involved in these public and political affairs as citizens, who are better citizens because we are Christians.

* * *

These considerations, we believe, are important in considering the philosophical or 'ideological' divisions in the several communities of the West. At this level the differences may be few, but the occasions on which they emerge on the level of action may be many. In his article Mr. Halle says that the main division is between those who give priority to ideological considerations and those who put strategical considerations first. He reminds us that in U.S.A., during the second world war after the fall of France, there were those who thought it necessary to come to terms with the Vichy government for practical strategical reasons, while others opposed it on grounds of principle. The same considerations divided the democracies over Spain. The 'ideologists,' says Mr. Halle, tend to have "fixed ideas, an accepted authority which is their guide and justification; are intransigent, intolerant, contemptuous of compromises, dissatisfied with limited victories. It is as we acquire responsibility for making this difficult world work that we discover that all victories are temporary, destruction is easier than creation, and human ignorance and imperfection are universal—yet it has to be made to work."

* * *

This "discipline of continuous responsibility" generally impels governments to give preponderant weight to strategical considerations, while on the whole the public (and we may add, the newspapers) tend to be dominated by ideological attitudes. So there is tension, if not conflict. When the tension becomes acute there is a point where in England the government falls. But its successor inherits its dilemma, for the first discovery that is made on assuming responsibility is that to ignore strategical considerations leads to disaster. (This is widely held to have been true of Baldwin's administration in this country, and would certainly be true if there was a change of government now.)

* * *

The support of public opinion in the foreign policies of the democracies has now become so important that, among other things, the newspaper proprietors and the Trade Unions have developed a power that does not yet threaten the authority of Parliament, but has manifestly grown greatly

in recent years, for the responsible statesman can only resolve his dilemma by persuading public opinion that the strategical course is right and necessary. When this cannot be done, or requires more time than there is, the government must choose between dissembling and risking a measure of governmental paralysis. In recent years both Britain and U.S.A. have had to dissemble to some degree and have suffered a limitation of their ability to act due to a necessarily uninformed public opinion. It is obvious that no democratic government or alliance can carry out a policy that is merely cynical. It would destroy us because we are who we are. Nor on the other hand can we long sustain an ideological policy that ignores considerations of strategy. The policies that were carried out by the Western Powers after the war are impressive and tragic illustrations of that truth. The children of light, if they are to survive and preserve for the future the painful gains of the past, must be not less wise than the children of this world, which means that within the limits of a proper applicable morality there must be room for a flexibility of strategical policy.

* * *

We call attention to Mr. Halle's article because there has been both in Parliament and in various Church councils a disposition to utterances and actions which thrusts upon the United Nations Organization a responsibility which it is as yet far too undeveloped to sustain. When the Mother of Parliaments herself, being called upon to debate a desperately serious matter of policy, breaks down into hysterical rowdiness, what is to be expected of an Assembly of some 70 nations, widely separated in ideology and strategical situation, and voting not by conviction reached by argument, but by national and group interests ? There are those in the world who would, if they could, destroy the Commonwealth and Britain herself in order to inherit her power. If they are successful we do not think the sum of human felicity will be increased.

* * *

Many of us who are old enough to have lived through the long series of crises since 1914 have often looked forward to a time when we should have leisure to read and reflect upon the real history that has swirled about us. But there has been no time of leisure and reflection. It is now many years since we ourselves began to hope for a day when the newspaper would be thrown aside because there was no news, a day when there would even be time to be bored. The day has not yet come,

but the histories have come streaming from the press. Some day another Gibbon will appear to tell how the old world died and the new world was born in the first half of the twentieth century. He will not lack material. But meantime it is the misfortune of the writers that their willing readers are distracted by the tumult of history still being made.

* * *

The latest of these volumes is *Men and Power* : 1917-1918 by Lord Beaverbrook (Hutchinson, 25s.), who has made an enormous collection of the private papers of the time of the first Great War. (The Lloyd George papers alone fill more than a thousand boxes !) It was a dreadful time, partly because the leadership was, like the rest of us, learning its job, and revealing in eminence all the familiar virtues and sins in the struggles for power. The author himself strove mightily, but unsuccessfully, as did others of the rich newspaper proprietors, especially Northcliffe, whose almost unbelievably macabre death-bed scene is vividly described. The book is immensely readable and is notable for the many character sketches of great men. The feet of clay of some of them are uncovered, though there is nothing that is merely malicious. It is, however, possible to read the book and forget altogether the enormous casualty lists that were appearing daily.

* * *

Chapter 8, entitled " The Lost Box," might very well be the last chapter of a political ' thriller.' It will be read with very strange feelings by all those who remember the one famous ' Maurice debate ' in the House of Commons, and especially by the older generations of Liberals.

The Prime Minister had given to the House figures of the man-power available in France after the disaster of March 1918, which were supplied by Sir Frederick Maurice, then Director of Military Operations. Later when Maurice was otherwise employed he wrote a letter to the press denying the accuracy of these figures and impugning the Prime Minister's good faith. Using this as ground for an attack upon the Government, Asquith, whom Lloyd George had displaced as Premier, moved what was in effect a vote of censure, which was followed by a division in which, by 293 votes to 106, Lloyd George was re-established in authority, Asquith discredited, Maurice placed on half-pay, and the Liberal Party fatally divided. There the matter rested. Four years later General Maurice wrote to the Prime Minister, re-opening the matter by saying that the man-power figures he had given

and were used in the debate had been hurriedly prepared, had been found to be incorrect, and had been followed by a memorandum giving the corrected figures. The Prime Minister had therefore used inaccurate figures in the House, though he had in his possession another return giving the correct figures. Lloyd George denied that Maurice had ever made any such correction. There for a second time the matter rested, and the incident with its dire consequences to the Liberal Party and the professional ruin of Maurice seemed finally closed.

* * *

Lord Beaverbrook now quotes an extract from the diary of Countess Lloyd George, who had been one of L.G.'s secretaries, which is dated 5th October, 1934 :

> Have been reading up the events connected with the Maurice Debate . . . and am uneasy in my mind about an incident which is known only to J. T. Davies [later Sir J. T. Davies] and myself. . . .
>
> I was in J. T. Davies's room a few days after the statement (i.e. in the debate), and J.T. was sorting out red dispatch boxes to be returned to the Departments. As was his wont, he looked in them before locking them up. . . . Pulling out a W.O. box, he found in it, to his great astonishment, a paper from the D.M.O. containing modifications and corrections of the first figures they had sent, and by some mischance this box had remained unopened. J.T. and I examined it in dismay, and then J.T. put it in the fire, remarking, " Only you and I, Frances, know of the existence of this paper." There is no doubt that this is what Maurice had in mind when he accused L.G. of mis-statement. . . . I suppose it is too late now for the matter to be cleared up and I had better keep silent.

Lord Beaverbrook comments, " The student of history may ponder these [events] with humility, mingled with a sense of human comedy. Through the oversight of a secretary, Lloyd George's government . . . was saved. . . . The direction of the war remained unaltered. The Liberal Party was destroyed.

THE HEIRS OF HEAVEN[1]

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, D.D.

Voi credete
forse che siamo esperti d'este loco ;
ma noi siam peregrin, come voi siete.
Dianzi venimmo, innanzi a voi un poco.
Purgatorio, ii. 61-64.

Away in a quiet Northamptonshire village churchyard is a tombstone which bears these words :—

They, alone, who Jesus love,
They whose hearts are fixed above,
To Him entirely given—
Whose only trust is in His blood,
Who live by faith, and live to God,
They are the heirs of heaven.

There is a boldness, a strength, about the verse, a strength of assurance and a boldness in the claim staked out, more especially in the severity of its limitation, which impressed me when I transcribed the words, some twenty-five years ago, from the tomb of my great-great-great-grandmother, Mary Smeeton, who died in 1829, aged 65. A faith so crystalline, a Christocentricity so adamant, recalls us with some sharpness from our more modern hesitations to the confines which, in the New Testament, considerations of life after death receive as their defining context.

* * *

The New Testament begins and ends with Christ : He is the Alpha and the Omega : Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today and for ever. And the Church begins and ends with the Resurrection. It begins with it in a story of heavenly messengers, who say that He is alive : and there is still no more essentially Christian greeting than " The Lord is risen ! "— " He is risen indeed ! " It ends with it in the sense that it cannot get beyond it ; for of His Kingdom there shall be no end : Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more, death has no more dominion over Him. He has the dominion over death as well as life : He is Lord both of the dead and of the living.

[1]The 1956 Drew Lecture on Immortality, delivered at Paddington Chapel, London, on 25th October 1956, and here printed by permission of the Trustees.

And of the living, note. His rising from the dead was not in order to rise to other worlds, this poor one all forgot. Still He will be Lord of those living in this world. Still there is, or can be, even as there was before, the closest relation, communication, communion between Himself and those whom He calls, and makes, His own, those who respond and follow Him in discipleship, trust and love.

So it had been throughout His ministry. In the beginning He had chosen twelve, to be with Him ; and to be with Him then had meant letting family ties go, abandoning your way of living and your livelihood, your security and what measure of comfort you possessed, abandoning it for a hard, roving, uncertain life, not knowing today what you would do tomorrow. But how well worth while it was ! As Jesus passed through town and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, just to be with Him was abundantly worth while ; while to hear Him say " You are the folk, who have stuck it through with me in all my times of trial and testing " was enough to break your heart. Peter and Thomas only spoke for them all when they said they were willing to die with Him.

One of the first implications of the resurrection of Jesus is that this relationship to Him, this being with Him, is still possible : is possible, indeed, in a far wider way than before. Before, only a few could be with Him. " Sirs, we would see Jesus," they cried. " If I may but touch His clothes, I shall be whole." As many as had diseases pressed against Him for to touch Him. There was no room, no, not so much as about the door. They uncovered the roof. But by and large it was no use. Only a few could be with Him. It was part of the straitening which at times was an almost unendurable constraint to Him. But now, that is over. The Lord is risen ! And in being risen from the dead, He is released from the limitations of all that dies : those physical, spatial, temporal limitations which, before, through the divine purpose of self-revelation in a human life, Jesus could no more evade than we can. Now, no longer solely the twelve, not even the ten times twelve met together in Jerusalem, but all who will may come close to Him in discipleship, trust, love and self-abandonment. His ministry is continued ; it is on a vastly wider scale, but it is the same ministry, on the same principles, and on the same moral conditions, as before ; which means that being with Him is at the heart of it.

That Christ is risen, and is there, with and among His

disciples, is in fact what creates the peculiar character and colour of life in the New Testament. When Paul cries that Christ lives in him, or that for him to live is Christ, he is not in an ecstasy, he is not claiming a special experience limited to himself. Equally to others he will write, Christ is among you ; your true but hidden life is your life with Him : nay, He is your life. In the words of good Dean Alford, " The only real life of the Christian is his resurrection life in and with Christ," " the new and glorious life of the Spirit begun here below and enduring for ever : the only life worthy of being so called " : " Christ is personally Himself that life, and we possess it only by union with Him and His resurrection."[2]

Moreover, we can hardly remind ourselves too often that Paul was not among those who had seen Jesus : so far as appears, he had seen Jesus neither before the crucifixion nor after the resurrection, not at least in the way others believed they had seen Him in the weeks immediately after it. Paul stands with us, this side the great divide, not with the twelve. It may be that the cessation of the mortal, corporeal, human element in their relationship to the Lord made it hardest for those who before the crucifixion had been closest to Jesus to accept and enjoy the new conditions. Whether that was so or not, it was left to Paul, above all, to proclaim the gospel of the resurrection, the good news that Christ was risen, and was there : saying, " I am Jesus, and it is Me that thou art persecuting, so closely am I one with My disciples ;" turning Paul aside from his course to Bithynia, not permitting him to enter upon it ; persuading him, on the other hand, to stay in Corinth, saying, " Fear not ; for I am with thee," assuring him, with a " Be of good cheer ! ", that he would achieve his purpose to see Rome. " Be of good cheer ! It is I ! Be not afraid ! " : so had the Lord always spoken. It was the same Lord, bringing the same good tidings.

Now it well may be that " geniuses or creative leaders," such as those among whom Paul, on any reckoning, must be numbered, " become sensitive organs of direct spiritual impressions and divine revelations which are missed by those who are busy alone with the affairs of time and sense."[3] But if we suppose that, with all his genius and sensitiveness, nay with all his discipleship and devotedness, Paul saw very much or very far, or even thought that he did, we mistake. Paul's

[2]Henry Alford, *The Greek Testament* (3rd edn., 1862), *ad Col.* III, 3, *II Tim.* I, 10, *Col.* III, 4.

[3]R. M. Jones, introd. to W. C. Braithwaite, *The Beginnings of Quakerism* (1st edn., 1923), p. xxvii.

unmistakable greatness, his humbling sincerity and humility, appear in his constant insistence that it is not so. ουχ οτι ηδη ελαβον "*not as though I had already*"—attained the prize or reached the winning-post—was surely suggested by the celestial heralds for Paul's patent of spiritual gentility.

If we miss this, we miss an essential aspect of the nature and burden of faith : the faith to which Paul turns and returns at every juncture, and from which life in the New Testament never strays far. In Protestant Christianity faith has received so much emphasis and attention that it has sometimes been in danger of becoming a towering juggernaut. In truth, of its nature, faith is a limited, partial, immature thing. Apologists remark that all our life rests on faith. That is true ; and it is wise to see that it is true and to accept the fact as an implicate of our humanity, or more religiously of our createdness, as a limitation on us that is set by God. It remains, none the less, a limitation ; and at no point are we more aware of being limited by it than in our relation to Christ, whom, if we love, we love not having seen, still resting in faith alone. We walk by faith, not by that which is seen, not by any visible form seen directly. There is always a medium ; a glass translucent but not transparent ; a metallic mirror which reflects but does it imperfectly ; a veil, a hint, a parable, an enigmatic element not wholly understood. However close we come to Christ, however sure of Him we are, here this will always be so : it is of the nature of faith.

Here, but not hereafter : not after death. Death brings freedom from restraint and limitation, brings fulfilment of the partial and immature. The restraint and humility of Paul's "not as though already" is finely, poignantly, counterbalanced by the eager excitement of his "but then . . .". As he holds the perspective glass of faith, Paul still sees only something like the glory of the place ; but at times its gates appear so near that his spirit faints to reach the land, where he may see the one who gives the place its glory, even Christ, as He is, without mirror, glass or veil. When Paul dares to contemplate this, he can hardly bear the constraint it sets upon him. He is conscious only of the desire to be released and be with Christ. That were far better. With Christ ? is he not that already ? Christ is his life, here. Yes, but while he is in the body, there is inevitably a degree of mediation, he must still be at a remove from the Lord. Only when at death he puts on immortality will mortality's limitations be broken through. Then, he will not only be with Christ as he is here ;

he will see Christ, will see Him face to face, will know Christ : know Christ as fully as, he believes, already Christ knows him.

In order to describe an activity possible only after death, when physical limitations are over, Paul writes of *seeing* Christ. Since seeing is itself dependent upon the body's co-operation, this may, logically, be confusing ; but it is hard to tell how else he could express himself, not better, but intelligibly. At a deeper level than the logical, his doing so is a moving measure of the passion with which, while still in the body, he longs to do just what, so long as he is in the body, he never can do, namely to see Christ. This passion is, in fact, the driving force behind his whole wider conception of a spiritual body after death ; and we may understand, and share, the passion without necessarily being tied to, or understanding, the conception. Certainly what Dean Alford calls " the one expression of a hope in which all other hopes culminate and centre "[4] is a familiar refrain in the hymns we sing.

Till with the vision glorious
Her longing eyes are blest . . .

That we may be where now Thou art
And look upon Thy face.

Until at last our wondering eyes
Look on Thy glorious face above.

Till, clouds and darkness ended,
They see Thee face to face.

The rending veil shall Thee reveal
All glorious as Thou art.

Those eyes, new faith receiving,
From Jesus shall not move . . .

Then let me on the mountain top
Behold Thy open face . . .

Not in that poor lowly stable,
With the oxen standing by,
We shall see Him . . .

The lines are from hymns of different centuries ; and when a desire is not only felt so long and so continuously but is regularly accompanied by the assurance that it will be fulfilled, it deserves respect even from those who do not share it. By those who do, the holding together, the delicate balancing, of the longing and the belief that it will be realized is found

[4] *op. cit., ad I John* III, 2.

to be of a piece with much else in Christian experience. On earth we live as children do, by hope, by hints, by promises, by pledges—nothing more. Yet all of these are forward-looking. They have, in fact, no meaning except as things to be fulfilled ; no meaning, that is, ultimately, save as they *are* fulfilled. Moreover, we do know in part. So far, hope maketh not ashamed. We have, already, the purchase-price, the deposit, the first instalment of what is to follow, the first-fruits of the harvest to come ; and we believe that He is faithful who promised.

Is then the rest of life a static period, to be spent waiting patiently, and in resignation, for release from what is limiting and partial ? Not at all. That would be to misunderstand the nature of discipleship and the desire at the heart of it to grow more like the Master. The Christian's course is not only from the death in life, which spiritually is what life without Christ is, to the deathless life, which is begun in the body but finds fulfilment only after the body's death. It is also a process of transformation into the image, the pattern, given in Christ, nay rather into Christ Himself, as the Christian and He grow together. The Christian remembers how Jesus said that the vision of God is given to the pure in heart ; and, strong in the hope to see Christ as He is, he seeks to purify himself even as Christ is pure. The Christian remembers how Jesus rebuked the disciples for setting their mind on the world's level instead of on God's, when they should rather seek God's will before all else and centre their heart's desire in heaven, not on earth. He also remembers how Jesus Himself put God's will first, even though it brought Him to the cross ; and, knowing something already of the power of Christ's resurrection, he does his utmost to live to God and to seek, and to set his mind on, the things that are above, not on earthly things. Again, the Christian remembers how Jesus overturned the conventional scales and standards of things and would ask what profit there could be in anyone's gaining all there was, if he did so only at the cost of losing himself ; and, eager to share in some measure in the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, he tries to learn to be willing for Christ's sake to lose, to give up, what before he counted his richest gain, and towards sin and temptation to be as dead. In all this he brings himself, so far as he may, into conformity with Christ's death, and hopes passionately that he is on the way to the resurrection life. Once more, the Christian remembers how Jesus said that only the man who, in another and a deeper sense, *was* willing to lose himself, to care so little for himself

as to give himself, to lose his life even, in love for others would in the end find his truest self, saved, preserved, made alive in the heavenly life. He remembers too how in His own life Jesus practised this pouring Himself out, and how by His death and resurrection He proved it true. Thus the Christian expects to spend himself and to be spent for the sake of others ; and, wherever he finds it, whether in others or in himself, he treasures every sparkle of such self-forgetful love as an undeniable token that, in principle, the passage from death to life is made.

Nor is this all, or even the half. For the Christian's Master is the risen Lord, whose ministry remains as constant and living, as effective and transforming, as ever it was in Galilee, when He said these things and lived and died. Still He attaches us livingly to Himself, still He shares with us His mind, His experience, all that His ministry costs Him, even the oft-repeated bitter cup. This is the deeper meaning of those many verbs and adjectives in the New Testament epistles which begin with συν, words which in English are less easily recognizable because of the variety of renderings used for the affix ('with', 'together', 'together with', 'joint', 'fellow' and sometimes nothing at all). It is not only that in all our afflictions He is afflicted. More wonderful still, He permits, nay draws, us to share in His own ministry of suffering love. To quote Dean Alford once more : " Every suffering saint of God in every age and position is in fact filling up, in his place and degree, the tribulations of Christ, in his flesh and on behalf of Christ's body. Not a pang, not a tear is in vain."[5] So, at last, by allowing us a share in His ministry of suffering, Christ will bring us to a share in His glory. Our outward man, our body, will be destroyed ; but our inward man, the hidden man of the heart, that life that has been hidden with Him, will spring up in renewal ; and whatever of His afflictions we may have been permitted to share, in the love and recovery of others, we shall count a featherweight beside the exceeding great glory of looking at the things which at present, with the body's eye, we cannot see, and, most of all, of beholding Him. For then, transformed by the Lord into His pattern, we shall be joint heirs with Him in all things. We shall be heirs of heaven.

* * *

This, or something like it, seems to me a fair account of the faith of the New Testament, and of faith continuing through the Christian centuries where it has been consonant

[5] *op. cit., ad Col.* I, 24.

with the faith of the New Testament, so far as concerns this particular aspect of life after death, namely being with Christ. For theologians it is only one aspect, one among many ways of regarding the subject, others of which have received attention in earlier lectures in this series ; though it is, I believe, an important aspect and one which we are inclined to neglect. From the point of view of Christian piety, of the experience which the theologian analyzes and upon the validity of which he pronounces, often with difficulty, as he finds its elements eluding his most careful formulation, it is less an aspect than the heart of the matter : it springs directly from the first preaching of 'Jesus and the Resurrection.' Being with Christ when He was in this life : being with Him now, while we are in this life : being with Him after death—for our present purpose I have sought to elaborate these concepts into something approaching an argument ; but for the first Christians they were less stages in an argument than moments in a single experience, the experience of the presence of the Risen Christ : " Lo, I am with you alway :" " There is not room for Death."

Those last bold words come not from the New Testament but from a poem which, while doubtless influenced by a Christian environment, is, rather, Stoic in its defiance and pantheist in its mysticism. The " God within my breast " whom Emily Brontë apostrophized was hardly the God and Father of Jesus Christ. Yet the poem is triumphant in its conviction : Emily Brontë's confidence in " The steadfast rock of immortality " is magnificent. I believe, moreover, that her interpretation of her experience is sound. Deathlessness subsists in the very quality of the mystical feeling which informs her poem. Nor is it necessary for us to possess her intense poetic power to be able to enter into something like her experience, which fundamentally is not uncommon. In terms of a lowest common denominator it may be described as a sudden consciousness of heightened significance. We may hardly be able to say *what* is significant : everything, " the totality of things." But

> There's a certain slant of light,
> On winter afternoons,
> That oppresses, like the weight
> Of cathedral tunes. . . .
> When it comes, the landscape listens,
> Shadows hold their breath : . . .[6]

and while it lasts, we are lifted strangely out of mortality into a sphere which death cannot touch. Such moments can be

[6] *The Poems of Emily Dickinson* (Boston, Mass., 1932), ed. M. D. Bianchi and A. L. Hampson, No. lxxxii.

precious. I know no valid reason why we should distrust them, if they come to us. A Christian will, rather, welcome them and find God in them : " The Lord is in this place," he will say, " this is the gate of heaven ;" or " Thou art with me ; then I will fear no evil, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death."

At the same time, these moments, however precious they may be, must not be confused with the Christian's faith in being with Christ and his consequent assurance of life after death. In the first place, such mystical feeling is limited in its incidence. It appears, in fact, to be characteristic of certain types of personality only, and to be undetermined by moral or spiritual considerations : Richard Baxter, for instance, was markedly lacking in it. The Christian's faith in being with Christ, on the other hand, and his assurance of life after death, are something which any Christian may have, and which every Christian should have. His faith does not, indeed, primarily depend upon feeling at all, however naturally it may be accompanied by and give rise to feeling, and however rightly it may control his interpretation of feeling. Nor is there in his faith as such any sense of deathlessness directly and *per se*, such as is present in mystical feeling. Life after death, as the Christian conceives it, is not an indestructible implicate of his being, a right to which he is born, like the fresh air of Haworth moors ; it is, rather, the gift of God, the outcome of an encounter between God and each soul, in which God takes the initiative as He did when He 'raised' Christ : theologically, the transitive reference of 'resurrection' is prior to the intransitive. The Christian's assurance of life after death is thus never a sheer *datum*, it is always consequent upon his faith, an inference from it we may say, albeit a necessary inference : " He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit " ; then, " God who raised up the Lord will also raise us up." Thus Baxter, for all his deficiency in " Sensible Consolations," knew a " rational satisfaction " and " doubted not of his Right to Heaven " as a Christian. Again, while limited in its incidence, mystical feeling is unconditioned and undemanding. It is also transient and leaves no lasting impression : the sense of deathlessness present in it passes : " Cold in the earth . . . cold in the dreary grave ! " The Christian's faith in being with Christ, on the other hand, involves him at once, as we have seen, in moral conditions ; demands are made upon his personality, and continue to be made ; and the gradual transformation of his personality, if he is obedient to these demands, out of love to the One who

makes them, in the end provides the best evidence that his faith in Christ and his consequent assurance of life after death are well founded.

They, alone, who Jesus love,
They whose hearts are fixed above,
To Him entirely given—
Whose only trust is in His blood,
Who live by faith, and live to God,
They are the heirs of heaven.

* * *

" They, alone . . . " : do we stick yet at that limit set so sharply ? We are eager today for as large a degree as possible of tolerance, understanding and accommodation. To reserve heaven for the disciples of Jesus will by many not only be thought ridiculous but be felt to be an outrage on the universality of God's love. If God should shut others out, has He not lost His character ?

For all its apparent penetration this question is, I believe, a superficial one. The universality it assumes for, or wishes to attribute to, God's love, a relationship undifferentiated and unconditioned, has no foundation either in the Bible or in our experience of any kind of love, divine or human, nor yet in any honest observation of the world in general. Its foundation, if it has one, is rather in that human craving for 'fair shares' which Professor Farmer rightly insists is, while one of the most difficult, also one of the most necessary, things for Christians to grow out of. It was not 'fair' or 'loving' of God to 'shut out' so many from 'knowing' Shakespeare ; and, while it is true that for Christian faith 'knowing' Christ is in a different sphere of discourse from 'knowing' Shakespeare, and its 'reward' is 'eternal' life instead of merely a heightening of 'temporal,' in relation to God's character the principle is the same. A religion which saved (!) the character of God at the expense of the Incarnation might be highly moral but would no longer be Christianity. A divine love which, in response to man's need, accepts the conditions of humanity and of history for its medium of revelation to man must also accept the implicates of those conditions. " When *Thou* hadst overcome the sharpness of death, *Thou* didst open the kingdom of heaven to all *believers*." There, in the *Te Deum*, is the characteristic setting for heaven as the Christian conceives of it, the being with Christ, the relationship of Christ to those who believe, with all the starkness of exclusivity implied which any relationship must imply, and without which any gospel, any

good news, must soon evaporate : without his equal insistence on the personal pronouns, Wesley's universalism would have won no one : "To me, to all, Thy mercies move." For *believers* there was no other good enough and there is none other name given. Only those who, while in the body, though now they see Him not, yet believing in Him, rejoice with joy unspeakable because, in faith and love, He is with them here, know the passion to see Jesus hereafter. Only they respond to the supremely great words which form the climax to *I Corinthians* xiii and without which half the wonder and glory of Paul's description of *agape*, of Christian love as we are to practise it here in this very difficult present world, would be lost : the words "but then face to face." And it is this, as we have reminded ourselves, which is the great glory of heaven in the only sense in which the New Testament knows anything of it. To a passionate conviction about life after death Emily Brontë had her own mystical path ; and, if our temperamental make-up permits us to do so, I know no reason why we should not walk with her along it. It can lead us a long way from the things which are seen, temporal and mortal ; nor do I think that it is a will-o'-the-wisp which beckons along it ; but it will not lead us to heaven. To life after death there may be many paths ; but not to the being with Christ in paradise which alone is heaven. If after death there is life of some kind for all, but life of a particular kind for some only, that would at least be consistent with the state of affairs here ; and, though ethically men have been inclined to think of life after death more in terms of redress of the state of affairs here, ontologically it may be more convincing to think of it as similar.

* * *

I can imagine that the considerations of the last few minutes have seemed to many somewhat arid and remote. Let us return in conclusion to Sibbertoft churchyard. There is another tombstone there, in memory of a great-grandson of Mary Smeeton's, Sydney Smeeton, who died in 1889. He was a lively, loving boy, the light of his parents' eyes and their only child. When they were 56 and 53 respectively, he died, aged 16. His parents were broken-hearted, as who would not be ? But they were Christians. They were people of no note, the father then known in Northamptonshire but long since forgotten. But both of them knew the New Testament and were at home in that divinest atmosphere of it which is timeless. To both, the power of Christ's resurrection was not a phrase but a reality ; and now more than ever. In their joy that the Christian, even Christ's little ones, may be with Christ, here-

after no less than here, their grief in the loss of their boy was assuaged ; and with a triumph still deeply moving they put this upon his stone :—

Is it well with the child ?
It is well.
Praise God ! The Shepherd is so sweet,
Praise God ! The country is so fair.
We could not hold thee from His feet,
We can but hope to meet thee there.

Sydney Smeeton's parents lived on into this century, his father to the age of 80, his mother of 85. And, when they both had died, this is what was put upon their stone :—

At eventide Jesus called them to the other side.

* * *

Though wise men better know the way
It seems no honest heart can stray.

Note.—The passage quoted at the head of the lecture may be translated :

" You think perhaps that we are experienced in this place ; but we are pilgrims as you are. Just now we came, but a little before you."

ETHICS FOR TODAY
in the Light of the Protestant Tradition[1]

By Walter M. Horton, Ph.D.

All the contributors to this symposium face the same perplexing world situation : a shrunken planet, turned into one small neighbourhood by rapid transportation and communication, but divided into two sharply opposing social systems, contrary in their ethical implications, competing with one another for the political control of the globe, while a few strong neutrals try by adroit diplomacy to maintain a 'third force' independent of both. In this " bent world," as Dr. Casserley appropriately calls it, all the great religious traditions of mankind are plainly called to do what they can to set the world straight, meanwhile helping their adherents to uphold standards of personal and social rectitude in spite of the twisting, distorting stresses and strains of their environment. Each seriously held religious faith is bound to claim that it can make a distinctive and effective response to this call, or else admit its own irrelevance and superannuation, as no living religion is prepared to do ; yet none of them can afford to ignore the wide influence of other faiths or the possibility that at certain points they might prove to be valuable allies in confronting common difficulties. A double task, then, is incumbent upon each contributor :

(1) to define what is distinctive in his own ethical tradition, and

(2) to show how this distinctive ethic relates positively to that universal ethic, comprehending whatever is sound in all traditions, without which our " Bent World " cannot become the " One World " that seemed so close at hand a dozen years ago.

Protestantism and universality may seem at first glance to be hopelessly at odds. Not only did the Protestant tradition originate in a revolt against medieval Catholicism (whose very name implies 'universality') but it has eventuated (against its will) in a bewildering variety of denominational divisions. How can a faith so divided against itself help to

[1]A contribution to a symposium (unpublished) on " Ethics for Today " at the Institute of Religious and Social Studies, New York, to which Roman Catholics, Jews, Eastern Orthodox and adherents of other faiths also contributed.—Ed.

straighten out a bent world? Moreover, it must be added that in its periods of greatest vigour and firmness of conviction, Protestantism has taken its stand upon two cardinal principles, *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*, which have tended to throw it into sharp opposition to Greek rational ethics, on the one hand, and the Jewish ethics of " law and good works " on the other —thus breaking up the carefully adjusted synthesis in which medieval Catholicism comprehended both Greek and Jewish elements. It is true that liberal Protestantism greatly modified these cardinal principles, and showed a deep concern for working out a new modern synthesis, in ethics as well as theology; but in quest of this synthesis it was betrayed into compromising alliances with modern thought, which the new Protestant orthodoxy has now renounced in favour of a bold reassertion of the old emphases on *sola scriptura* and *sola fide*. How can such a consciously anti-Greek, anti-Jewish, anti-Catholic ethic possibly help to establish a universal ethic?

In all candour it must be admitted that the Protestant tradition in Christian ethics has " two strikes against it " when confronted with the task of restoring universal ethical standards to our divided, distorted, relativized world. Yet I am convinced that Protestantism can nevertheless make some unique contributions to the accomplishment of this task. The very pluralism of the Protestant churches has secured one precious value without which the so-called 'free world' would be gravely embarrassed in its struggle to resist the totalitarian domination of Russian Communism: *religious liberty*. This is a value specially cherished by the 'free church' wing of Protestantism.

What is more, the recent history of Protestantism has proved that without compulsory legal conformity to an established church, a high degree of unanimity in matters of religion and morals is attainable by free discussion and free consent. These are the methods employed by the Ecumenical Movement which, starting on Protestant soil and jealously guarding the liberties dear to Protestants, hopes now to recover the Catholic unity of Christendom by free discussion and practical co-operation, leading toward a free consensus in faith and morals which may be commended to the world by at least a majority of the presently divided but eventually reconciled churches of Christendom. The same general methods which have already led to greater unity between various Christian denominations, both Protestant and Catholic, are capable of being applied, I believe, to the narrowing of divergencies between the Christian and the Jewish, the Jewish and the

Greek, the Occidental and Oriental traditions, and even in the last resort between the 'religious' perspective which these traditions all share and the 'anti-religious' perspective of Marxism, officially maintained but unofficially nullified in various degrees under régimes supported by Moscow. The effort made by liberal Protestantism to approach a modern synthesis by conciliatory discussions on all these wider fronts remains a necessary effort, despite the discredit cast upon it by the blundering compromises into which the first negotiators were betrayed. In other words, while I see little hope of sectarian Protestantism contributing to the restoration of a universally valid ethic, I see great hope of ecumenical Protestantism contributing to it; and while this contribution is impeded both by a reiterative Protestant orthodoxy and a weakly compromising Protestant liberalism, I see great hope in what may be called Protestant neo-liberalism, continuing the synthesis-making efforts of the old liberalism but avoiding its blunders. Let me try to spell this out in two stages.

I. *The Distinctiveness of Protestant Ethics*

Unless each ethical tradition has something distinctive to say to the contemporary world, it might as well not speak at all. This is the point to which Reinhold Niebuhr addresses himself, in the opening chapter of his *Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, on "An Independent Christian Ethic." While he thinks that the ethics of Protestant orthodoxy have difficulty in speaking to the modern man because they are relative to an antiquated situation and irrelevant to the modern scene, he contends that the ethics of Protestant liberalism fail for the opposite reason, because too dependent on modernity. "In adjusting itself to the characteristic credos and prejudices of modernity," he writes, "the liberal church has been in constant danger of obscuring what is distinctive in the Christian message and creative in Christian morality. Sometimes it fell to the level of merely clothing the naturalistic philosophy and the utilitarian ethics of modernity with pious phrases."[1] A good example of the type of liberal Protestant ethics here alluded to would be Richard Cabot's definition of "right desires, agreements or plans" as those "governed by reality as it shows itself in our needs," and "wrong desires, agreements or acts" as "those which diverge from reality and from our needs through self-deceit."[2] Helpful as Cabot's book is

[1] Reinhold Niebuhr, *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1935, p. 5.

[2] Richard C. Cabot, *The Meaning of Right and Wrong*, Macmillan, New York, 1933, p. 453.

in making particular ethical decisions and implementing them through the use of what he calls "ethical brakes and tractors," one may hunt all through it without discovering any distinctively Christian or distinctively Protestant motives or goals for ethical conduct. Until the very end, when a new level of conduct (the 'supermoral') unexpectedly appears, and Christian language is used to describe it, Cabot's whole argument is consistently naturalistic and utilitarian. The same may be said of Durant Drake's book, *The New Morality*, and other typical expressions of liberal Protestant ethics. They express what H. Richard Niebuhr calls "the Christ of culture"—Christian ethics so identified with the prevailing trends of modern Western civilization that they can hardly be expected to judge or correct those trends.

If liberal Protestantism has pretty generally failed to state the distinctiveness of Christian and Protestant ethics, neo-orthodox Protestantism has made this neglected task its special concern. Nowhere is this concern so clearly manifest as in Emil Brunner's great ethical system, *The Divine Imperative*, whose German edition originally bore the significant subtitle, *Outline of a Protestant Theological Ethic*. "It may seem an audacious statement," he says in his Preface, "though it would not be very difficult to prove its veracity, that since the time of the Reformation no single work on *ethics* has been produced which makes the Evangelical faith its centre."[3] In the conviction that "in Luther, Zwingli and Calvin the knowledge of God, not only in the 'dogmatic' but also in the 'ethical' sense did break in as at no other time since the days of the Apostles," Brunner regards it as part of his "distinctive calling" to demonstrate "how brightly this light shines even today upon our problems."[4] In what may be regarded as the key chapter of his book (Chapter viii) he deliberately takes the most distinctive theological doctrine of the Reformation, Justification by Grace Alone, as the "foundation of the Good" and the cornerstone of Christian ethics. The effect of this doctrine is to distinguish true Christian ethics sharply from all legalisms, whether of the Jewish, Catholic, or Kantian variety, and from all philosophical ethics, whether of the naturalistic or the idealistic school. There can be no confusion and no synthesis, he contends, between the ethic of divine Grace given in Christ and any ethic of 'self-security', any conception of the Good as an abstract principle humanly attainable, whether by rational self-realization or by legal self-justification. From

[3]Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, translated by Olive Wyon, Lutterworth, London, 1937, p. 10.

[4]Ibid., p. 107.

this perspective, only God is good and every man a sinner, hopelessly alienated from the good until he gives up his self-confidence and " receives, purely as a gift, that justification which he seeks in vain to attain for himself." The life that flows from this divine gift of forgiveness is, as Luther taught, a grateful life " lived from God as its centre,"[5] free from the legalistic " sense of ought ; " but it is at the same time subject to a new divine 'demand' for the obedience of faith, as Calvin taught : " law without legalism, freedom without self-will and illusion . . . the love of God . . . and the holiness of God . . . *Romans* interpreted by *Matthew*."[6]

That this Lutheran-Calvinistic conception of the good life as one of gratitude for Divine grace, and free obedience to the Divine will is classically and characteristically Protestant, needs little argument. That it casts light upon contemporary problems is not so evident at first glance. Yet by skilfully combining it with other traditional Protestant concepts, such as serving one's neighbour to express gratitude to God, accepting one's secular calling as an indication of God's will, and taking the " orders of creation " (family, economic order, political order, etc.) as real though imperfect expressions of God's kingdom upon earth, Brunner works out his definition of Christian ethics (" *the science of human conduct as it is determined by Divine conduct*") into an orderly system of recommendations for doing what God wills, freely and gratefully, in all sorts of modern circumstances. Rejecting all casuistry and all fixed moral principles, on the ground that they destroy the personal, concrete, free, and unpredictable character of the true God-man-neighbour relationship, he nevertheless does not fall into vague and empty iteration in his ethical counsels. Admitting that his ethics " can decide nothing beforehand," he claims that they can " prepare the decision of the individual as carefully as a conscientious legal adviser prepares the decision of the judge by the most careful consideration of all possibilities."[7] Employing a doctrine of the " orders of creation " which some Lutheran theologians have used to justify conservative submissive acceptance of the existing social order, whatever it may be (even National Socialism), Brunner escapes this pitfall by distinguishing in every social institution :

(1) That which represents the will of God the Creator ;

(2) That which is perverted by man's sinfulness ; and

[5] Ibid., p. 76.
[6] Ibid., p. 81.
[7] Ibid., p. 139.

(3) That which God the Redeemer is renewing and transforming in preparation for His final Kingdom.

In some concrete situations, faith's discernment of God's will by the light of His revealed Word and living Spirit, may perfectly well lead to revolutionary social change instead of to conservative acceptance of the *status quo*. A Protestant ethic in which the reforming spirit was dead would certainly be an odd phenomenon !

I have indicated that I regard Brunner's *Divine Imperative* as a very able reply to the questions, " What is distinctive in the Protestant ethical tradition ? " and " What light can the Protestant ethical tradition cast upon contemporary problems ? " Though not of Brunner's school of thought, I would go so far as to say that any future answers to these questions must reckon with his answers and build upon them. My main difficulty with Brunner, and in general with the neo-orthodox school he represents, arises in connection with the *universality* of his ethics. To that issue—inescapable in our " bent world," as we have seen—let us now turn.

II. *The Universality of Protestant Ethics*

Neo-orthodox Protestantism, with its primary concern for maintaining a distinctive outlook upon the modern world, is of course not simply indifferent to the issue of universality, nor simply bigoted in its attitude to other ethical traditions. Emil Brunner, for example, expressly claims that his ethics of grace are universally valid, despite the obvious fact that they hold good only for those who share his trust and gratitude toward the God of grace revealed in Christ. " Whatever God demands can only be universal," he says, " that is, valid for all men, even if those who do not hear this demand do not admit this validity and indeed do not even understand the claim to universal validity."[8] The final goal of this Divine demand is as universal as God Himself is universal : " That God claims us for *Himself* means that He claims us for the *Kingdom of God*, for a love which is absolutely universal and unlimited."[9] This seems to imply that non-Protestant and non-Christian ethical traditions, though they may be false in the ultimate principles that govern them as systems, may contain truths that are consistent with true Christian ethics. Legalism is false, but antinomianism and anarchism are also false, and law has three distinctive functions in the Christian life : to discipline the old Adam in us, to drive us through

[8] Ibid., pp. 89-90.

[9] Ibid., p. 116.

desperation to repentance, and to guide the new redeemed life toward its absolute goal in the Kingdom (Chapter xiv). Hedonism and eudaemonism are false as systems, but it is part of the Christian's calling to make his neighbour happy. These qualifications make it impossible to identify Brunner's neo-orthodox position with any such completely isolated anti-cultural position as Richard Niebuhr describes in his chapter on " Christ Against Culture." Brunner's subsequent books on *Justice and the Social Order* and *Christianity and Civilization* make this abundantly clear.

While an approach can thus be made to the problem of universality from the neo-orthodox point of view, it is questionable whether an attitude of serious respect for other religious traditions and other moral philosophies, permitting genuine alliance and co-operation between them can be built upon this point of view. If the Protestant version of Christian ethics can give " the answer, the only answer, and the whole answer to the ethical problem," as Brunner claims,[10] the consequence certainly seems to be that other ethics are incapable of making any significant contribution to Christian ethics, and any attempt to combine Christian with non-Christian ethics in a universal synthesis (as the medieval Scholastics did in their Natural Law doctrine) is a colossal blunder, destined to failure from the start. What I have called the 'neo-liberal' type of Protestant ethics protests above all against this strict exclusivism of neo-orthodox ethics, and pleads for the necessity of some sort of synthesis between Christian and non-Christian ethics, despite all the hazards involved in the process.

A good statement of this neo-liberal contention will be found in a recent book by Professor George F. Thomas of Princeton, *Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy*. Thomas finds Brunner's strictures against the errors and self-contradictions in secular moral philosophy " not so much false as irrelevant."[11] There may be important truths in ethical systems that are erroneous in many respects ; even an error in their ultimate principles does not reduce them, as Brunner contends, to " a mere caricature " or " heap of ruins," in which moral truth is falsified at all essential points. Nor is a " synthesis of insights derived from different moralists " necessarily a betrayal of one's own tradition in faith and morals. " Brunner fails to see this," says Thomas, " because he thinks that the only kind of synthesis is an eclectic one, a

[10]Ibid., p. 51.

[11]George F. Thomas, *Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy*, Scribner's, New York, 1955, p. 384.

mere patchwork of ideas pieced together artificially. But this is only one kind of synthesis, as the history of thought shows."[12] Inconsistencies in the medieval Catholic synthesis or in the modern liberal Protestant synthesis only prove that they were not made with due care, not that the attempt was futile. Specifically, Thomas sees in the moral 'principles' and 'values' so derided by Brunner helpful means whereby the absolute religious ethic with which Christianity began its career, could be related to the long series of changing cultural environments through which it has lived in the course of its history.[13] There was no explicit social ethic in the New Testament, no analysis of cultural values in the æsthetic and intellectual spheres such as one finds in Plato. Christians therefore had to borrow what they did not at first possess. If they were not to withdraw from the world, they could not avoid these problems, and yet they could find no solutions of them in the Gospel. Therefore, they were forced to look for solutions wherever they could find them."[14] Modern man is still faced with the same necessity that confronted the Fathers, the Scholastics, and their Protestant successors : to maintain the basic truth of the ultimate Christian perspective by borrowing or inventing 'middle axioms' that enable him to apply this ultimate perspective to problems arising in new forms. If the mediating principles belie the ultimate perspective, the synthesis is badly made ; " valid insights drawn from moral philosophers must be transformed or 'converted' (says Thomas) before Christians can make use of them."[15] (The same could be said of insights drawn from other religions.)

It can be seen from the above that Thomas is no more proposing to revert to the liberal " Christ of culture " than Brunner is proposing to revert to the archaic " Christ against culture " phase of Christian thought. Both men are critical of the medieval Catholic synthesis, in which (according to Thomas) " juxtaposition of unmodified Aristotelian ideas with Christian ones tends to obscure the latter."[16] Both men approximate, from opposite angles, to the method of synthesis which Richard Niebuhr calls " Christ the transformer of culture ; " though Brunner, out of admiration for Luther, sometimes comes close to his method of dualistic 'paradox' in relating Christian and non-Christian ideas. I see no reason

[12] Ibid., p. 385.

[13] This is similar to Reinhold Niebuhr's comparison of such philosophical principles to 'diagonals' by means of which one may descend from the 'vertical' tip of an absolute religious ethic, and apply this ethic to the 'horizontal' relativities of the emerging historical situation.

[14] Ibid., p. 389.

[15] Ibid., p. 392.

[16] Ibid., p. 392.

why the neo-orthodox and neo-liberal types of Protestant ethics might not eventually be reconciled in an 'Augustinian synthesis' such as Richard Niebuhr favours:[17] one into which elements from many different traditions in our pluralistic world culture would be deliberately and hospitably admitted, so as to encourage communication and cross-fertilization between them ; one in which all terms from non-Christian and non-Protestant sources would be carefully sifted and redefined so as to bring them into essential harmony with the distinctive Protestant position. In Brunner's recent *System of Dogmatics*, he shows himself hospitable to Greek metaphysical concepts in Christian theology, provided only that connotations inconsistent with Christian faith are carefully refined away from such loaded terms as 'absolute,' and they are redefined in a Christian context.[18] If this can be done with Greek metaphysics, why not with Greek ethics ? If with Greek ethics, why not with Jewish, Moslem, Confucian, or Buddhist ethics ? If Brunner would concede as much as this to the liberal concern for universality, I am sure that Thomas would gladly agree with him that the task of synthesis-making is a delicate and difficult one, and may easily lead to betrayal of one's own distinctive faith.

Whatever the dangers and difficulties of this task, I am convinced that the present state of the world—through which the will of God for mankind is silently and mysteriously but insistently pressing upon us—demands imperatively that such a synthesis be attempted. Time was when a series of diverse cultures and civilizations, each with its own unique religio-ethical foundation, could coexist peacefully on this planet, because they had relatively little contact with one another. Before the discovery of America, several of these rival cultural systems did not even know of one another's existence. Today, all formerly independent cultural areas have become vividly, and even painfully, conscious of one another's pressure ; and it is no longer possible for them to live at peace in the same shrunken world, unless the fundamental ethical conflicts between them are faced and somehow resolved. What Lincoln said of the North and South a century ago, that they could not permanently coexist " half slave and half free," can be said today about our whole planet. By devices similar to the Missouri Compromise, and by the familiar diplomatic method of the balance of power, we are endeavouring with

[17] H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture*, Harper, New York, 1951, chap. 6, especially pp. 206 ff. on " Augustine and the Conversion of Culture."

[18] I have discussed Brunner's position on theology and metaphysics in *Christian Theology : an Ecumenical Approach*, chap. III, Lutterworth Press, 1956.

fair success, so far, to prevent the profound moral divisions of our world from breaking out into overt civil war waged with suicidal weapons. But unless the Soviet world converts the free world, or the free world converts the Soviet world, or some other method of adjustment is found between them, our house divided against itself shall not permanently stand. This is the urgency of the demand the Lord of history now makes upon us all—whether Jewish, Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant, Moslem, Buddhist, of whatever faith or lack of faith—for some wider ethical agreement than heretofore upon which the common moral life of humanity can be grounded.

It is right and proper that each living faith should work out its answer to this common problem in terms of assumptions derived from its own distinctive revelation of the will of Heaven for mankind. If any religious or ethical tradition allows its primary source of enlightenment, the very light which brought it into being, to be darkened, how can it expect to enlighten either its adherents or its rivals ? Yet it is essential and necessary in our time that all faith and traditions should throw a considerable proportion of their ethical recommendation into the form of propositions addressed not only to the conscience of fully convinced believers, but to the common experience of mankind. Such propositions should be communicable and explainable in terms intelligible to men of other faiths, and even to men prejudiced against all the classical religious faiths, as Marxian Communists are.

In a previous study of *Natural Law and International Order*, published during the Second World War,[19] I defended the thesis that the time-honoured idea of " Natural Law," *i.e.*, universal moral law embedded in the structure of human nature and nature-at-large—an idea first clearly formulated by the Stoics, reformulated by the Christian Fathers and Scholastics, reaffirmed in radical form by the philosophers of the Enlightenment and the American and French Revolutions —was an idea demanding new scrutiny if a durable basis for international order was to be laid at the close of the War. I knew of course that it was an idea for which neo-orthodox Protestants had little use ; that to Karl Barth and his consistent followers, Natural Law was as nonsensical a notion as Natural Religion or Natural Theology, and the revealed Word of God was the sole and sufficient basis of ethics and theology. Yet it seemed to me that by discarding Natural Law altogether, and giving ethics and theology a purely revelational basis, neo-orthodoxy was refusing to provide any basis for needed

[19] See *Christendom*, vol. IX, No. I, 1944, pp. 2-21.

co-operation, or even for negotiation and communication, between adherents of rival revelations, between different interpretations of the same revelation, or between believers and disbelievers in the very idea of revelation. I remarked, for example, that Catholics and Protestants could honestly co-operate on the basis of Natural Law, despite the serious incompatibility of their interpretations of the Christian revelation ; and Communists could be allied with Christians in what I called a " common law marriage " based on a few agreed principles of natural law, though their ultimate outlook on life sprang from sharply opposed assumptions. The break-up of the wartime alliance between Russia and the West, and the tragic persistence of the 'cold war' between the former allies, have not destroyed my belief in this thesis, but rather confirmed it. Without at least some minimum agreed concepts concerning human nature, nature-at-large, and the kind of moral conduct required by their structure, all efforts to end or mitigate the 'cold war' will reduce themselves, as recently at Geneva, to smiles and promises unsubstantiated by consequences, and a disembodied spirit of cordiality fluttering about like Noah's dove (or Picasso's) over the waters with no place to set its foot on solid earth.

I hope I have no illusions about the difficulty of this task. I agree with Brunner that the present moral consensus of mankind is " very limited in character," reducing itself to the universal presence of *some* " sense of ought," *some* distinction between right and wrong, " wherever there are human beings," plus a very small residue of agreement between rival and largely conflicting definitions of the meaning of right and wrong.[20] But I believe that this universal moral sense can be brought to greater clarity, and this small agreement as to the meaning of right and wrong can be increased, by patient and persistent conference between the adherents of different ethical traditions, even those most remote from each other. I have seen this method increase agreement between divided Protestant sects, without destroying or compromising the loyalty of each conferring group to its own faith ; and I see no reason to suppose that the effectiveness of this 'ecumenical' method is limited to the intra-Protestant field.[21] Again, I recognize with all the neo-orthodox critics of the Natural Law theory that 'nature' is a fundamentally ambiguous term,

[20] Brunner, op. cit., pp. 32, 33.

[21] In the field of world politics, one of the hardest of all fields, this method has led to the formulation of the U.N. statement on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. In spite of frequent violations and opposing interpretations of this statement, it provides a solid nucleus of the international ethics we need.

many of whose historic connotations are inconsistent with Biblical faith—Stoic pantheism, for example, or *laissez faire* optimism that makes the self-seeking of the 'economic man' work out for the general good! I hold no brief for any of these questionable connotations, and would endeavour to exclude any that are clearly inconsistent with the religious revelation to which I give my faith. But ambiguity and need of clarification attach to revelation as well as reason. Unless a religious revelation is to be proclaimed by arbitrary authority the meaning of God's revealed word must be interpreted in harmony with the structural lines of the world He has created, and His commandments must be corroborated by their congruity with man's deep-implanted needs. The will of God to which Protestants appeal is a will " whose service is perfect freedom "—for all, and not only for us. We know that our definitions of the Divine will are subject to correction and possible amendment; but the Divine will itself we commend to men of every faith and of no faith, as the ultimate good.

Briefly, then, I conclude that the Protestant tradition has two great contributions to make to the major ethical issue of our age, which is that of ethical conflict and relativity in a shrunken world. (1) By its distinctive conception of Divine grace it lifts this moral ultimate, God's will, high above all the relativities of contending creeds and codes. Refusing to 'absolutize the relative' by erecting any system of invariable rules, it asserts that God Himself has 'relativized the absoluteness' of His will by participating in the historic process, thus pointing the way to the endless, flexible, adaptations of the absolute to the relative which every modern man must make. (2) At least in its ecumenical and neo-liberal forms, modern Protestantism shows a deep concern and a growing skill for the developing of a free ethical consensus, first among divided Protestants, then between Protestants and Catholics, then between Christians and non-Christians, whereby men still honestly differing at many points may work together toward the unbending of our bent world. Respecting the liberty of other traditions, as it demands respect for its own liberty, it offers a hand to all who will join it in patient discussion and practical co-operation, looking toward a world in which liberty and union are not (as now) enemies, but as Daniel Webster hoped, "one and inseparable." In this "responsible society" the freedom cherished by the West and the social cohesiveness cherished by the East would be at last peaceably united.

MARIOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY

By E. L. Allen, Ph.D., D.D.

There is a striking passage in Karl Barth's *Dogmatik* in which he states clearly what he considers to be at stake in the controversy with Rome. It is not necessary to debate this or that detail, the whole matter is summed up in the veneration that Church accords to Mary and the dogmatic substructure by which she supports this. The man in the street who is ignorant of theological matters yet knows that just at this point the Churches divide, over this he must take sides with or against the Reformation. Barth cites the praise of Mary in the liturgy : " All the heresies in the whole world thou alone hast destroyed." Is not this a frank confession that the Marian dogma and the Marian cult occupy a central position in the Roman system, are the article by which that system stands or falls ? The heresy of Roman Catholicism lurks in what the Protestant cannot but term its Mariolatry. Mary as *Mater Dei* is the principle, the prototype, and the epitome of its conception of grace and of the part played by the creature in salvation. That man by virtue of prevenient grace can actually co-operate with God in his redemption—this is what Mary stands for and, as such, she is intimately associated with and represents the Church.[1]

We can follow more in detail the reasons Barth gives for this judgment. Roman theology is emphatic that Mary, in spite of the graces bestowed upon her and in spite of the honour paid to her, does not encroach upon the divine sphere. She remains a creature, and it is as such that she plays her part in the work of redemption, mediating grace and offering intercession for men. She attains her place above the saints but below God because of her acceptance of the promise given to her by the angel, her consent to God's use of her to effect His entry into the world. In virtue of her purity and sanctity, both of which qualities, of course, she owed to God's grace, she merited to become mother of the Lord of all. In this one person that is done which is subsequently to be done for all who come within the Church that continues her work. In such a scheme, what becomes of the awful gulf between Creator and creature ? It vanishes, for God by his grace puts the creature in a position to cross the gulf. He can give to

[1] 1/2, 157.

God what is of value to Him, what He needs to do His work in the world. Against this, Barth asserts the sovereignty of Jesus Christ in His Church. There can be no question of a contribution from the human side ; all is of God. Faith is not our part in redemption ; it is our acknowledgment that we can have no part, but are thrown altogether upon God.

From the Roman Catholic side there is no hesitation in accepting this challenge. In the last chapter of *The Splendour of the Church*, Henri de Lubac cites the passage from Barth that I have paraphrased and adds the comment : " Setting on one side the value judgments that go with it, we can accept the Barthian analysis. Catholic faith regarding Our Lady sums up symbolically, in its special case, the doctrine of human co-operation in the Redemption, and thus provides the synthesis, or matrix concept, as it were, of the dogma of the Church. Thus it has been said that both these doctrines should be maintained or allowed to crumble away together."[2] In a recent popular work by two priests of the Catholic Missionary Society, a judgment by Pierre Maury on the same lines as that by Barth is quoted, and the authors add : " He disagrees—but he sees the point."[3]

There is one feature in Barth's criticism of Mariology that will strike many Protestants as strange. He holds that a sound doctrine of the Incarnation permits us to accept and sanction the use for Mary of the title " Mother of God." What we cannot do is to agree to the deductions that have been drawn from this. Dogmas such as the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption of the Virgin are neither based on Scripture nor consistent with the Gospel. There is no ground whatsoever for assigning to the person of Mary in the course of revelation even a relatively independent position so that we should be justified in making her the theme of doctrinal discussion or elevating her to a place of peculiar honour. All this must be swept away as so much error. Marian dogma is not a development from the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation, it is an excrescence upon it, an alien growth that must be simply cut out.[4] In what follows I propose to ask whether this separation can logically be carried out. Is it not rather the case that a conception of the Incarnation that would justify the designation of Mary as Mother of God would yield, with a minimum of perversion, the subsequent Roman dogmas ? If that is so, then we must ask whether rejection of the dogmas

[2]Op. cit., 239f.

[3]George Dwyer and Thomas Holland : *Mary Doctrine for Everyman*, 33.

[4]Op. cit., 153.

does not entail and even suggest another approach to the Incarnation.

I

In what sense, then, is the Incarnation understood by those who deduce from it the Marian dogma? The Incarnation, it is held, took place by the union of divine nature with human nature in the womb of Mary. Aquinas can speak of the heavenly marriage, which "began in the Virgin's womb, where the Father espoused the Son to human nature in unity of person."[5] This, of course, is not peculiar to the Roman Church. It is affirmed in some detail in the Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church, *Quaestio* xxxviii,[6] and is the theme of some of our best-loved Christmas carols. It is indeed the Christology of the Ecumenical Creeds and as such is common to Catholic and Protestant. Barth defends the ancient formula of "one person in two natures" against the charge of operating with physical categories. Those who were responsible for the definition were concerned, he argues, simply to maintain that Christ is Lord of the whole man and not merely of some 'spiritual' element in him and also that "the divine Being in its unity and totality" was present in Christ.[7] I do not think, however, that one is guilty of disrespect towards the Fathers when one says that they were children of their time and therefore tended to think of the union of the divine and human in Christ after the fashion of a union of two *things*—in this case two natures—in the womb of Mary.

Once this has been conceded, it is difficult to deny that Mary may legitimately be acclaimed as 'Mother of God,' and Barth, as we have seen, would not do so. For it was in her womb that the Logos was made flesh, that the manhood was assumed by, taken up into, God. The embryo carried and nourished thereafter by her was the Second Person of the Trinity united with human nature and, further, personalizing it. "Although Jesus Christ was born of her not after his Godhead, which is eternal, but after the manhood, still she is rightly called the Mother of God; because he that was born of her was, both in the conception itself and in the birth from her, as he ever is, *very God*."[8] Once this second step has been taken, a third becomes easy, for some even logically requisite. How can the womb that received God and sent Him forth into

[5] *Theological Texts*, trans. Thomas Gilby, 339.

[6] P. Schaff: *The Creeds of the Greek and Latin Churches*, 319.

[7] Op. cit., 141.

[8] From *The Longer Catechism of the Eastern Church* in Schaff: Op. cit., 472.

human life have subsequently borne other children? Mary, it is now affirmed, remained a virgin to life's end, and the brothers of Jesus spoken of in the Gospels *must* have been His cousins.

Other and more serious inferences are drawn from this view of the Incarnation. The decree of Pius IX read to an assembly of cardinals and bishops in St. Peter's on December 8th, 1854 affirms that " the doctrine which holds the Blessed Virgin Mary to have been, from the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of mankind, preserved free from all stain of original sin, was revealed by God, and is, therefore, to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful."[9] I cannot myself dismiss this as a mere excrescence, a piece of theological fantasy, as most Protestants do. Once Mary is regarded as the vessel chosen to receive God in the sense of containing Him in some way spatially within her at first, and later to train the God-Man so begotten for His work as redeemer, it seems to me only natural to suppose that she was given grace beyond the common measure. Does not an Incarnation so understood require an untainted medium?

Even the latest development in Marian doctrine does not seem to me too far-fetched, when one bears in mind the premisses from which it is derived. I do not for one moment suggest that the dogma of the physical assumption of Mary should be considered seriously ; the point I wish to make is that its formulation drives us to ask whether the account of the Incarnation that Protestantism has taken over from Rome is in fact one with which we should continue to work. *If* Mary was preserved from original sin, it is not in accordance with justice that she should suffer the penalty of death brought by Adam on the race. *If* therefore she died—and the new declaration does not assert that she did—death must have been for her something quite different from what it is for us. But what happened to that body that was for a while the temple where God himself dwelt ? Could it be suffered to see corruption ? So, " by the ninth century, a Spanish missal puts the doctrine of the Glorious Assumption (i.e. the assumption of Our Lady body and soul into glory in heaven) on the same level as the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and the Ascension of Our Lord."[10] The doctrine is old, only its elevation to the status of dogma is of recent date.

[9]Ibid., 212f.

[10]Dwyer and Holland : Op. cit., 37.

II

Our feet are on a slippery slope indeed. We took the first step without thinking, the creeds and the hymn-book made it natural for us to do so. But where are we now as a result? Before we go back to examine this first step—the entry of God into human life by way of Mary's womb—we must examine in greater detail the place assigned to Mary in Roman theology. We shall find, I think, that this entry of God of which we have so far been speaking is enclosed within and made possible by another entry of a different order. The Incarnation of the Word required as its precondition the consent of Mary. God had created her a free person and so could not simply impose Himself upon her. In the Annúnciation He offered to her the high privilege of bearing the Redeemer, and by her humble reply: " Behold, the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word " she accepted her destiny. " She was not just a physical machine for projecting God to the rescue, like the elaborate contrivances they used on the Greek stage. She was a human person. God chose her *as a person* to be the instrument and dwelling-place of the hypostatic union. It is supremely noteworthy how God's first approach, through His angel, is to Mary's mind and will. Only after her spiritual consent, the physical relation is verified. No wonder thinkers and saints dwell lovingly on that phrase which sums up the tradition of the Church: *prius concipiebat mente quam corpore*: —she first conceived Him with her mind."[11]

There could be no clearer statement than this. God, we are to understand, entered the world for us men and our redemption first through a personal and ethical relation, a call on one side and its acceptance on the other, and only through this was " the hypostatic union " made possible. Nor does this union with God in mind and will cease when the child is born. It continues throughout her life. While unqualifiedly human, Mary lived in such unity with God as is to be found in no other member of our race. That is the meaning of the dogma of her perpetual virginity. " Mary's virginity was the fine flower of her immaculate heart. Her heart was immaculate in the sense that it was entirely, unreservedly given to God. Her whole personality was dedicated to Him. Nothing less than a vow of virginity would be appropriate to her life."[12] Devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary is justified on the ground of reverence for " the way in which Our Lady's whole personality was utterly devoted to the love of God and the love of men."[13]

[11]Ibid., 28. [12]Ibid., 13. [13]Ibid., 56.

Mary therefore incorporated into her life without reserve the mercy of God, His will to uplift and redeem the world. Her love became the channel of His love. She therefore embodies the saving will of God in a human life, and as such is precisely that combination of human sympathy and divine power we need. As such she is a partner in God's redemption, she mediates His grace. " Because she is the Mother of God, we draw to her with confidence, assured that from her own humanity will spring her wish to help us, and from her close union with God her power to do so."[14] Again : " If we win grace for others in proportion as we do God's will—how great must be the grace Mary won for us ! For she was more perfectly attuned to God's Will than any other person can ever be or hope to be. God in His goodness does the will of those who do His will. God's generosity is drawn upon by Mary as by no other."[15] We are told that " the completest expression of God's Will towards man is Mary with her Child in her arms."[16]

But if now we have to choose between the help given by one who is united to God in will and that given by one who is united to Him hypostatically, in the realm of 'nature', while the theologian may urge that the former is rooted in the latter, the common man will be disposed to reverse the preference. For him the human heart that beats in sympathy with his failings and yet at the same time mediates the grace of God will prove the stronger attraction. That this is so in popular devotion is well known. Nor are there wanting theologians who would provide some degree of justification for this preference. So : " There is surely no false instinct in going to Our Lady when we might be ashamed to approach her Son."[17] Bede Jarrett uses even stronger language. " The chroniclers tell us that when Edward III had made up his mind to destroy the burghers of Calais because of the harm they had wrought upon his subjects, and had refused to spare their lives even at the request of his best soldier and his favourite knight, the Queen of England hurried from her court across the sea to add her petitions to the same cause. Wrathful at her arrival and her demand, he could only answer : " I can deny nothing to the mother of my son." In applying this to Our Lady, is there not in this purely human view of God and His dealings with men, something of comfort ? He does not, indeed, repent of His commands, but He may well have willed to spare at the request of the Mother of His Son."[18]

[14] Bede Jarrett : *Our Lady*, 10.
[15] Dwyer and Holland : Op. cit., 31.
[16] C. C. Martindale : *The Faith of the Roman Church*, 97.
[17] Dwyer and Holland : Op. cit., 42.
[18] Op. cit., 28.

III

Why does such language at once strike the Protestant as blasphemous? Because Mary in fact usurps the place of Christ. What is said of Jesus Christ in the New Testament is asserted of her, and that without the sanction of the New Testament. The description of Mary as mediator between God and man in virtue of her full participation in our human experience, apart from sin, and her unqualified obedience to God is reminiscent of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. I share to the full the Protestant objection to such an estimate of Mary; I am concerned only to show whither our repugnance leads us. We are forced to ask whether we did not concede too much right at the outset, by taking over from the ancient Church an understanding of the presence of God in Jesus Christ in terms of substance and nature rather than mind and will. The Roman position is stated clearly in Newman's verse:

> And that a higher gift than grace
> Should flesh and blood refine;
> God's presence and His very self,
> And essence all-divine.

If we remain true to the Gospel as the Reformers rediscovered it, we cannot allow that God gives us less than 'His very self' in giving us His grace.

Let us attempt to translate the old formula 'one person in two natures' into language consistent at once with modern philosophy and Protestant religious conviction. By 'nature' we mean that which is characteristic of something, in virtue of which it is distinct from everything else. In the case of God, must we not say that His nature is holy love? I mean by that a love that is charged with the numinous, that has in it the awful distance separating the divine from the human, the Creator from the creature, the holiness that is too pure to behold evil, the judgment and rebuke of absolute righteousness. It is the love also of self-giving, the love that leaps the gulf between God's holiness and man's sin, that involves itself in our human experience and suffering. In the case of man, is not his nature freedom? He is the one creature who is invested with a threefold responsibility, to himself, to his fellows, and to God, the one creature to whom an active participation in the divine purpose is assigned. Now, in the person of Jesus Christ, that is to say, in His life-history, His relation to God and His dealings with men, in His words and deeds, His ministry and death and triumph over death, we see these two made one. For a person is not a mysterious X

that stands behind what is said and done and suffered, he is the self that comes to expression in the whole course of these.

The life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are therefore the union in a single life-history of God's love identifying itself with man in his need and sin and of man's obedience offering itself as the means by which this identification may be effected. It is best to be clear exactly what this implies. It implies that the unity of the divine and the human was not effected in the womb of Mary but in the growing experience of Jesus, His life of devotion and obedience towards God and of sympathy with and service of men. The Incarnation was only possible with His consent and came about in the measure to which He discerned the purpose of the Father with His life and offered Himself to fulfil that purpose. I do not indeed see how it is possible, if God is holy love and man is freedom, for their union to be effected in any other way. God does not insert Himself into the world, He calls, invites, offers ; to effect an entry, He needs someone to respond to that call, to accept that invitation. On this view, it is clear that no ground remains on which Mary can be termed the Mother of God. Not until freedom had developed in her child could God's holy love find its way into the world through Him as it longed to do.

It will perhaps be said that this is to substitute an ethical Christology for a metaphysical one, and therefore—it is assumed—a lower for a higher. That however is not the point at issue. The preliminary question that must be asked is : What do we mean by 'metaphysical' ? For me, the realm of the metaphysical is that which transcends everything that can be an object for our thinking, that which is unattainable because ultimate, yet ever-present because at the base of everything. It is the mystery beyond the world (*Transcendenz*), and the mystery within the self (*Existenz*). As such it is apprehended not in any addition to our knowledge, but in the transformation of the self. It is such that we *cannot* speak of it, yet we *must* speak of it. We must do our best to express it in clear-cut, rational language and argument, yet we shall express it least inadequately at the point where such an effort breaks down. There is no flight here from reason into emotion, no evasion of the duty of serious reflection. But what language shall we use ? Shall we speak of the Transcendent as though it were a *thing*, so that the union of God and man is represented as a fusion of two natures in a particular location (Mary's womb) at a particular instant (that of conception) ? Or shall we follow the precedent set by the New

Testament : " God is love ; and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God in him ? "

We do not need, that is to say, to think of God as entering the world twice, once personally and ethically when Mary gave consent and a second time hypostatically. There is but one entry, through a human mind and heart and will that put themselves wholly at the Father's disposal. He who did this was thereby constituted the Son of God. Others have lived with God as servants with their master or as subjects with their king ; he alone as the Son, the unique, the only-begotten Son with God as Father, as his Father. " All things have been delivered unto me of my Father : and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father ; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." Because he has participated in our human lot from within, he has the sympathy to help us ; because God's will of holy love is active in him, he has the power. There is no place therefore for Mary or the saints. " There is one God, one mediator also between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus."

IV

It may be as well to recapitulate briefly at this point. The Roman Church has put Mary in the place of Christ because she set out from a view of the Incarnation that assimilated it to the fusion of two things rather than to the co-operation of two centres of personal activity. But the language she uses of Mary and the devotion she offers her betray quite clearly that the latter, and not the former, is what is needed for our salvation. Protestantism therefore would do well to restate the doctrine of the Incarnation in personal and ethical terms, whether along such lines as have been suggested above or in other and more satisfactory ones. But it will be argued that I have brought back precisely that co-operation with God in redemption to which Barth objected. My reply would be that the objection seems to me to lie rather against the idea of merit than against that of co-operation. For is it not part of the Biblical message that God does His work in the world through dedicated souls ? Yet in no sense do such persons merit His use of them. Nor does co-operation on these terms mean that man contributes part from his own resources and God therefore is reduced to the level of partner. Where love wins freedom, all is of God and all of man. The life of Jesus Christ was at once a genuinely human life and the decisive deed of God for us men and our salvation.

If now, as the result of an initial error, the Roman Church has transferred to Mary what may legitimately be asserted only of Christ, it is possible that, once we have uncovered that error, we shall see that even the developments of Marian dogma may be read as pointers to what is true of Christ. The mystery, for example, that surrounds Mary in the Roman scheme is one with that which surrounds Christ on the view I have set out. If she " was always seen along with her Son ; always she has been the predestined channel of God's favours to us,"[19] can the Incarnation have " waited on Mary's consent?"[20] If she had refused, what would have happened ? If she was not free to refuse, what becomes of 'merit' and 'co-operation' ? In a similar fashion, if we say that Jesus Christ is Son and Saviour in virtue of His obedience to the Father's will, He becomes merely an example of human achievement. If we say that He was such by virtue of God's choice of Him, he becomes a mere instrument in the hands of God. In the one case, we emphasise the human at the expense of the divine, in the other, the divine at the expense of the human. The mystery of Christ is that we cannot get behind the unity of the two and say that one is a mere consequence of the other. In the language of the old Christology, the person is not to be divided and the natures are not to be confused. At the same time, we must insist that the initiative is with God. The manhood was taken up into the Godhead, the Word was made flesh.

If we penetrate the mystery of Mary further, we come upon the Immaculate Conception. We have seen that there is no ground for such an assertion in her case, as there is no need for it. What is there in Jesus Christ that corresponds to it ? We shall not transfer it to Him literally and speak of a special conception in His case, for this would make His purity and love the mere consequence of something physical or quasi-physical about His origin, would transfer it from the world of freedom to the world of objects. Each human life, we may say, is constituted by a particular relation to God. With us, the relation is one that has been marred, in part lost and in part recovered. There is one human life that is constituted by an unbroken relation to God as Son to Father. Here alone there is no barrier between God and man. The sources of His being were not tainted as ours are. To say this is because he was ' of one substance ' with God is to reduce His holiness to a natural fact, something that was bound to be

[19] Martindale, op. cit., 97.

[20] Dwyer and Holland : Op. cit., 30.

because He had been made in a certain way. That would rob it of value. His holiness lay in His dedication as the constant expression of His freedom. There we touch upon the ultimate mystery of Christ.

Finally, what of the dogma of the Assumption? Clearly, this is a case in which assertions about Christ have been applied to Mary, so that she duplicates her Son. It is perhaps the most perplexing feature of the traditional Christology that it asserts that the human nature of the Lord, including His physical body, have been taken up into heaven. To understand that literally would be to shatter the unity of the Godhead. What it means, I take it, is that the union of God as holy love and man as freedom in the life of Jesus was so intimate that it can never become a mere past episode. It remains to the end of time an integral part of all God's dealings with our race. He to whom we pray and He who answers us is the God who came to us and gave Himself for us in the human experience and self-sacrifice of Jesus.

CORPORATE CONGREGATIONALISM

By J. A. Figures, M.A.

The purpose of this article is to discuss what we mean by Congregationalism when we think of it in a corporate or denominational sense. We know what we mean by a Congregational church, but what do we mean when we think of Congregational churches living and acting together? How are they related to one another and how do they together form a part of the great catholic Church of Jesus Christ? In other words, what is the ecclesiastical or doctrinal status of a Congregational county or national union, and in what relation does it stand to the many separate churches that comprise it, and they to it and to one another?

Congregational Unions exist but, ecclesiastically speaking, they are a haphazard development which has never really been defined. They have become increasingly necessary to the life of the churches and to their national and ecumenical significance; in fact, the local churches, in the present form and pattern of their existence, could hardly get on without them, but they have never been established on any real doctrinal foundation. They have come into existence out of certain historical situations and have been adapted to meet successive crises and needs, but they have never been thought into the Congregational idea of the Church, or more accurately, our Congregational idea of the Church has never been sufficiently enlarged to embrace in any ordered way the existence and necessity of Congregational Unions. The corporate life of Congregationalism has been thought of only in such vague terms as co-operation, mutual edification, fellowship, and the like, and not in terms of the Church of Jesus Christ in the world which is one Body.

We begin, where as Congregationalists we must always begin, with the local church. The Roman Catholics would begin with the Vatican and work down to the local church. The Anglicans would begin with the Archiepiscopal Province and work down through the diocese to the parish, but as Congregationalists we can only begin with the local church. A Congregational church is thus described in the Savoy Declaration of 1658:

(*Of the Institution of Churches, and the Order appointed in them by Jesus Christ*—G.1. verso) :

II. In the execution of this power wherewith he is so entrusted the Lord Jesus Christ calleth out of the World in Communion with himself those that are given unto him by his Father, that they may walk before him in all the ways of Obedience, which he prescribeth to them in his Word.

III. Those thus called (through the Ministry of the Word by his Spirit) he commandeth to walk together in particular Societies or Churches, for their mutual edification, and the due performance of that publique Worship, which he requireth of them in this world.

IV. To each of these Churches thus gathered, according unto his mind declared in his Word, he hath given all that Power and Authority, which is any way needful for their carrying on that Order in Worship and Discipline, which he hath instituted for them to observe with Commands and Rules, for the due and right exerting and executing of that Power.

It is an attempt to get back to the New Testament pattern of the Church as founded by Jesus Christ and separated from any worldly association in so far as it is founded and sustained by the relationship of its members to Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. Where two or three are gathered together in His name, there is He, and where Christ is, there is the Church.

The church is not founded on any organisation or orders or traditions of men, but simply on the living presence of Christ, and where Christ is are all the means of grace. Where men and women covenant with the Lord and with one another to love, obey and serve Him, there is the Church, complete and glorious, in the sense that possessing Christ it possesses all things. By definition, the church must consist of Christians, and the only ruler of the church is Christ Himself.

That is a very high and profoundly spiritual conception, so do let us not describe Congregationalism as democratic. Democracy is a gift which Congregationalism has helped to give to society, but it is a word far too small and misleading to be applied to the Church. In a democracy men rule themselves; in a Congregational church men are ruled by Christ. Let us be careful also how we use the words freedom and independence, because in a Congregational church they should mean something very different from what they usually mean in the world. We are free only in the sense of being free to obey

Christ, and we are independent only of those secular or ecclesiastical powers that would challenge the sovereignty of Christ in the church or hinder us in an obedience to what we believe in faith and prayer to be His will. There is a sense, and it is a real sense, in which we are more closely bound in a Congregational church than in any other, and we must recover and express that high churchmanship, that sense of deep personal and collective commitment to Him who is Saviour and Lord, the Head of the Church.

But if that is what Congregationalism means in terms of the local church, what does it mean when there are many local churches? Clearly the Church of Jesus Christ in the world is the whole Christian community which embraces all local Christian communities, and which has a place and purpose in the world bigger than them all. The local communities are all *churches* possessing all the means of grace, and all the privileges and responsibilities I have described, but at the same time, they are only parts of *The Church* which embraces them all.

This corporate conception of the Church was quite clear in the minds of the early Congregationalists of the 16th and 17th centuries. With all their emphasis on the local church and its autonomy under Christ, they had no intention of being ecclesiastically presumptuous or schismatic. To use Dr. Douglas Horton's phrase, they disliked the separateness of Separation as much as the authoritarianism of Episcopalianism or Presbyterianism. From the beginning they were as concerned to express their unity with each other in the visible church of Jesus Christ as they were to safeguard their independence from any authority either secular or ecclesiastical which would question their right of freedom to receive the gifts of Christ and obey His will as they were led to understand it in fellowship and prayer and the reading of the Scriptures.

Although Robert Browne was not the first Congregationalist, he was the first to systematize the Congregational conception of the church, and as early as 1577, in his *True and Short Declaration* he made it quite clear, even before he led the little company at Norwich to join themselves to the Lord in one covenant and fellowship together in 1580 and, in spite of all his separatism and independence, that provision should be made "for seeking to other churches to have their help." "Synods" he says "are the meetings of sundrie churches together when weaker churches seek help of the stronger and should be held for the redressing or deciding of matters." In

his book, *The Life and Manners of True Christians*, he says "A Synod is the joining together or the partaking of the authority of many churches met together in peace for the redressing and deciding of matters that cannot otherwise be taken up." In 1584 he wrote, "By all means convenient local churches are to have the counsel and help of one another in the common faith under Christ the Lord."

In 1610 John Robinson of Leyden, who later encouraged the Pilgrim Fathers to seek their religious freedom in a new land, made it quite clear that he had a conception of the church and of the church meeting as something much wider than the local church. The church, he said, is most truly visible when it is assembled in one place, and the communion thereof most full and complete when all its members, inspired by the presence of the same Holy Ghost, receive the same provocations of grace, when the churches banded together with one accord pour out their prayers to God. This Assembly under Christ uses and enjoys every one of His institutions, communion of saints, word of God, sacraments, censures, and ministrations of Christ appointed and therewith enjoys the same most gracious presence.

Robinson is there saying that a Union of Churches is itself a church.

The *Cambridge Platform* of 1648 emphasises the same thing.

> The churches ought to preserve church communion with one another consisting of (1) prayer and care for one another ; (2) relief by community of gifts ; (3) maintaining unity and peace ; (4) seeking and accepting help in divisions and contentions ; (5) taking notice in love of troubles and scandals and giving help ; (6) admonishing one another when there is need for it.

In these early years, the word 'independent' did not mean anything like what it came to mean in the 19th century. Alongside the essential Congregational principle of the completeness under Christ of each local church, there was also another essential principle, that since all local churches belong to the one family of the Lord, they necessarily belong together, and owe to each other affection and loyalty and corporate activity.

In 1645 we find a group of people at Hapton, near Yarmouth, writing to the Yarmouth church to ask if it will allow its pastor to preach to them and administer the sacraments ;

then, later, writing again to the Yarmouth church to ask if it thinks they are now ready to become a church themselves ; and later again, in 1648, writing to ask advice on whether non-paedo-Baptists should be admitted to membership. On this point the Yarmouth church refused to give an answer until all the churches in the area had met and considered the matter.

The same acknowledgment of corporate responsibility is to be found in the *Savoy Declaration* of 1658.

After rejoicing that the churches like separate ships had sailed the same course, the representatives went on to confess their neglect of association and their need of it, and to prevent a recurrence of this admitted neglect they said in Section 26 of the Order of Churches that " in cases of differences and difficulties, either in doctrine or administration, wherein either the churches in general or any one church is concerned, it is according to the mind of Christ that the churches do by their appointed messengers meet in synod or council to give their advice."

And later, Jeremiah Burroughes, who was a member of the Savoy Conference wrote that " although Synods are not entrusted with powers over the local Congregations, those in the Christian way must acknowledge (1) that the churches are bound in conscience to give account of themselves to other churches about them ; (2) that Synods and Councils of the Churches are an ordinance of Jesus Christ ; (3) that Councils from the power they have from Christ may admonish men and churches in His name ; (4) that as there may be cause, they may declare men or churches to be subverters of the faith and may refuse communion with them until they repent.

In all this there is implied not simply a Congregational doctrine of the local church, but also a doctrine of the churches. There is a clear understanding that the churches are as many branches of the same vine, that although the local church is in one sense complete, in another sense it is incomplete ; and that the basis for the corporate life of the churches is not accidental or haphazard, but is as theological, Scriptural and spiritual as the basis of any one of them.

Unfortunately, this early idea of the unity of the churches was never properly systematised in thought or completely worked out in practice. Political and ecclesiastical events moved too quickly. After the restoration of the monarchy and the episcopacy in 1666, and the Act of Uniformity in 1662

persecution again broke out and the Congregational churches had to pursue a scattered and isolated existence. For the most part they were confined to rural areas, and the paramount necessity laid upon them was to preserve the principle of independency and the sovereignty of Christ within His Church and, in spite of the Act of Uniformity, the Clarendon Code and all the prohibitions and disabilities and persecutions that went with them, this they did against all political and ecclesiastical pressure.

This period of enforced isolation was in some ways good for Congregationalism because it was under the hammer of this persecution that the foundations were driven deep, and that the principle *Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia* was enthroned, proved and demonstrated, but in some ways it was unfortunate because it gave no chance for the doctrine of the unity of the churches to develop.

During the eighteenth century there were some attempts to express this unity, but although they are significant they did not amount to very much. In 1690, within thirty years of the Act of Uniformity and within two years of the Act of Toleration under William and Mary, we find an Association being formed to link up the ejected ministers and find out what had happened to them. A fund was started by annual collections to assist impoverished ministers.

In 1727 the London Board of Congregational Ministers was formed and Philip Doddridge did a great deal to encourage the association of Dissenting churches and ministers for their mutual encouragement and benefit, but during most of the eighteenth century those contacts and associations were very local and short-lived, for although Congregationalism in this period was free from the persecution of the seventeenth century, it suffered grievously in the great decline of religion that took place between 1714-1750, during which many churches were closed, many became very weak, and the general temperature of Congregationalism as of all religion was very low indeed.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century, under the impetus of the Evangelical Revival, we find a new movement starting towards unity, or rather towards united Christian action. It was an attempt to fulfil the new urge to evangelize at home and abroad. But it must be noted that, great as were the effects and consequences of the Evangelical Revival on the whole life of the country and far beyond, its emphasis was less on the Church as the redeemed community than upon personal salvation ; and great as were the gains in numerical

strength and religious zeal, there was a serious loss in the conception of the Church and the understanding of churchmanship, a loss that affected all the denominations. In the Anglican Church it gave rise later to the Oxford Movement and its efforts to restore the uniqueness and supernaturalness and authority of the Church as the Body of Christ and the household of faith. But Dale was right when he said that Congregationalism never regained what it lost in the Evangelical Revival. The high and pure conception of the Church that belonged to Congregationalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the gathered and covenanted community, the Ark of God, deriving all its life and authority from Christ in the midst of His people and the high vision of churchmanship was obscured and dimmed. The change of emphasis is to be seen in the change of our architecture away from the Meeting House to the auditorium, and in the change in the conception of the Church Meeting from waiting upon God in worship and prayer to the democratic institution of one man one vote.

It is against this changed background that this new movement towards united action at the end of the eighteenth century is to be seen. All over the country societies were formed to further the cause of evangelism. It was not so much a coming together of the churches as a coming together of zealous individuals who solicited the support of the churches in various Christian works. Some of these societies were interdenominational in character, some were specifically Congregational. First there were preaching societies, then County Home Missionary Societies, then the formation of the London Missionary Society and the Bible Society, which was not so much the acknowledgment by the churches of their overseas missionary obligation and the creation of their own missionary agency as the work of a few who formed their own Society and then sought support for it in the churches.

Early in the nineteenth century there were several unsuccessful attempts to form a national Congregational Union, but the idea met with little response and much opposition from those who saw in union a threat to the independence of the local churches. The emphasis at this time was on the separateness of the churches not from the State but from one another.

By 1831 there were 34 County Associations and in that year 26 of them expressed their approval of a national Union, and at a meeting at which there were only 66 delegates from the whole country where there were 34 County Unions and

1,600 churches, the Congregational Union of England and Wales was formed.

In the formation of that Union can clearly be seen the change that had taken place since the first attempts at union and co-operation in the seventeenth century. The instigators of it were at great pains to deny any Scriptural, theological or religious need or basis for the Union. It was, they said, expedient for the churches to co-operate in their own interests and in the interests of evangelism.

For ten or fifteen years it gained little support, and by 1846 its Annual Meeting could muster only 173 people.

Algernon Wells who was the Secretary at that time said : " Like all other Associations of Congregational churches this Union has and claims no Scriptural authority, but avows itself a voluntary and human expedient." On that basis the Annual Meeting agreed " that the Union was in harmony with Congregational principles to secure the advantages of co-operation and fellowship."

If we look at the objects of the Union we find that they emphasise the perfect independence of each local church and deny to the Union any legislative or other authority. It was to provide simply an expedient means of promoting evangelical religion and for the co-operation in mutual interests of separate autonomous churches. For a very long time there was considerable opposition, and the Union gained its place very slowly. In all the arguments for the Union and Statements by the Union there seems to be no thought whatever of the churches having any responsibility for each other. The emphasis is on the unqualified right of independency—that in the local church there are all the requisites of authority and power, that where there is a church, there is *the* Church and that there can be nothing in the sense of a church beyond that.

It was on this doctrinal basis then that our Unions were brought into being. During the years since they have undertaken more and more the responsibilities of guiding and safeguarding the interests of the churches. They have won their way by the service they have rendered, by the help they have given in the building of new churches, assisting ministerial stipends, various kinds of church aid, the care of retired ministers and widows, the publication of literature, the inspiration of new movements and activities and so forth, until they have become an indispensable part of Congregational life and well-being. What began as unnecessary but expedient has

become essential until Congregationalism as we know it today is unthinkable apart from the work the Unions are doing.

But still they have not been thought into and integrated into the life of the Church. They still only exist doctrinally on the basis of 1831. They are generally acknowledged and their usefulness more or less accepted, but today we are living in a new world with entirely new social, economic and religious pressures and tensions, and it is becoming urgently necessary for us to look again at the Unions and this whole question of Congregational unity, and to ask ourselves what exactly are these Unions ; where do they fit in to our doctrine and picture of the Church ; what is their status ; what is their relationship to the local churches and what is the relation of the local churches to them ? Are they simply beneficent Associations outside the churches to which individual Congregationalists and churches subscribe, or have they any ecclesiastical standing ? Do they impose inescapable obligations on every church ?

These are urgent questions, and that for two reasons. First because under the social and economic and administrative pressures of today, the work of Unions is indispensable to the well-being of all the churches as we know them. You cannot take away the service of the Unions, the recruitment and training of the ministry ; the responsibility for ministerial status ; the assistance given to ministerial stipends ; removals and settlements ; the care of retired ministers ; church aid and church building ; the provision of literature ; the trusteeship of church properties ; and all the inspirational activities of the Unions, and leave Congregationalism where it is. Here is an example from one District in the Yorkshire County Union in which there are thirty-nine churches. The amount of help given in loans and grants in respect of 14 churches has amounted to £27,000 in seven years. The amount of help given to stipends in respect of 9 out of 24 ministers has been more than £9,000. If that had not been possible, the whole condition of the District would have been changed. Churches would have closed—the number of ministers for 39 churches would have been reduced to 13, and the consequences would not have been felt only by the aided churches, but directly or indirectly by all of them. In the whole country we have about 1,350 ministers, and nearly a third of them, in one way or another, to a greater or lesser degree, receive help from the Maintenance of the Ministry Fund.

The great problems of church extension are no longer local

matters—they are problems that can only be dealt with collectively and corporately—that is, by Associations and Unions, which means that more and more the life of our churches is becoming a denominational matter. But what is the denomination? In many respects it is still something that exists apart from the churches—dependent not on any articulate doctrine or acceptance of ecclesiastical responsibility—but upon the goodwill and interest of a comparative few. Rather like a charity which we recognise as good and in which we are interested and to which we give support, but separate from ourselves and for which we have no responsibility.

And the other pressure that is upon us is the pressure of the ecumenical developments of recent years. Where and how does Congregationalism fit into the developing pattern of the World Church? How does the local church make its contribution to, and receive benefits from, the ecumenical life of the whole Church of Christ.

One of the great problems of the ecumenical movement is the problem of how separate and autonomous churches can be united with a sense of belonging together like many branches of the same vine. But what has Congregationalism to say to that problem, until it has solved its own almost identical problem of the relationship and unity of its own churches? I fear that unless Congregationalism can find the answer to its own problem, it will be left aside in the probable religious developments of the next fifty years. And let us not be misled by the fact that so many Congregationalists are called to ecumenical service.

How then shall we meet this situation? First we have got to be prepared to acknowledge it and think about it individually and in our churches. We must begin, of course, by affirming that in a local church properly constituted, living in and by the Gospel and the discipline of Christ, there is given by Christ all requisite authority and power, but we must also affirm as did the early Congregationalists that there is a sense in which the local churches are related parts of the whole Church, and that there is a necessary and inescapable relationship of the churches with each other.

That, I think, implies that what we know as Unions have a real ecclesiastical existence and must be given their proper place in our idea of the Church; that the Unions are not outside the churches but an essential part of their life without which their life and witness for Christ cannot properly be fulfilled; that when the churches meet together through their

chosen representatives, the Union they comprise itself bears the marks and characteristics of the Church ; that there is a sense in which the saying *Ubi Christus ibi ecclesia*, or "Where two or three are gathered together in my name I am in the midst," is as true of a Council or Assembly of the churches as it is of the churches themselves. If that be true then we can at least understand what Browne meant when he said that a synod partakes of authority and when Robinson said that a Union of the churches is itself a church, we shall recognise that in a properly constituted assembly of the churches with Christ in the midst—there is also the authority of Christ.

That brings us to two centres of authority, but they need not be contradictory. It will involve tensions no doubt, but tensions are not relieved by saying they are contradictory or by ignoring them, but by acknowledging them and trying to resolve them. To say that a Union has authority under Jesus Christ obviously does not mean that it has a right to dictate to the churches or to over-ride their authority under Christ, but it does mean that the Union has a right to make decisions and formulate policies that may affect the local churches,and to speak for the local churches ; that its deliberations have a divine sanction which cannot be disregarded by the local churches except under the most solemn and vivid sense of conscience and divine guidance ; that the attitude and relationship of a local church to the Union and its reactions to decisions of the Union should be precisely the same as the attitude and relationship of a church member to his church.

This is not the way in which our churches generally think of the Unions, and it will mean a transformation in the corporate life of Congregationalism if they do think in this way and know themselves to be no less under the constraint of Christ to fulfil in faith and prayer and service their obligations to the Union of churches as their obligations within their own church. It will bring into the Unions a richer atmosphere of deep spiritual significance all through our denominational life. Their work will be made easier and swifter as churches and Unions become attuned to each other. It will open up new ways of experimentation in unity, out of which a great and needed contribution might well be made to the ecumenical needs of the churches. For if Congregationalism can show that it really does know the way by which separate and autonomous churches can live together in a united and integrated life, walking together as if they were all parts of the same Living Body, it will be for the good of all Christ's flock and of all Christ's work in the world.

SOME PRACTICAL ASPECTS OF CHURCH UNION

By R. A. Letch, B.D., B.Sc., Ph.D.

Future church historians may well refer to this century as the period of union. It has already seen the union of the three main branches of British Methodism, the formation of the United Church of Canada and the inauguration of the Church of South India. Never before has there been so much concern expressed at the fact of Christian disunity, or so much discussion about Church union. Increasingly the Churches are co-operating and consulting with each other. Organisations as varied as the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Mission to Lepers and the theological faculties of the Universities afford examples of interchurch co-operation. Each of these is able to serve the Churches more efficiently than if each Church endeavoured to do this work in isolation. In what has been accomplished and in what remains to be done it is essential to recognise the place of practical, non-theological factors.

It may be true that ultimately most of the important questions are theological, but it is an occupational disease of theologians to ignore the practical problems and the non-theological factors which inspire human action. It is allied to the philosophical mistake of thinking we can usually distinguish between cause and effect. In practice cause and effect are so interrelated that the picture is not of a causal chain but rather of a network. In the same kind of way theological and other factors combine to produce a climate of opinion which in turn modifies these selfsame factors. For example, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Reformation was both cause and effect of a climate of opinion that favoured independence of thought and of social life. We cannot ascribe it all to a theological revolution without remembering the scientific work of Galileo and Leonardo da Vinci which culminated in the Copernican revolution. Neither can the rise of nationalism be ignored. It was " a society stirring with diverse intellectual interests. The theological atmosphere had given place to a much more independent outlook, in which many questions were freely discussed from a rational point of view. A history of scientific thought must take into account the effects of such an upheaval " (i.e. the Reformation).[1]

[1]Sir. W. Dampier, *History of Science*, p. 118.

R. H. Tawney's great work, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*,[2] gives further illustrations of the action and reaction of theological thought, economic factors and human history. He states, " As the changed environment became not a novelty, but an established fact, these doctrines had to be modified " (p. 30). So, too, religion shaped economic thought, for " Calvinism endowed the life of economic enterprise with a new sanctification " (p. 47). Possibly his most striking phrase is a quotation from Wyclif (p. 33) that " in this world God must serve the devil." This is another way of recognising that our Christian faith is incarnational. God uses the facts of human nature and human history as He used the death of Jesus on the cross, the greatest of human crimes to bring about human redemption.

The rise of the Free Churches took place in the dawn of democracy in the modern sense, and their best days seem to be in the hey-day of private enterprise. Today the churches are growing together in an age when 'union' is part of the atmosphere. Some industrial projects, atomic energy projects and development of new types of aircraft, are beyond the reach of any except the largest firms, or even governments, for technical and financial reasons. It is a truism to remark on the growing oneness of the world. By radio and air travel the world has been made one neighbourhood. Out of this physical propinquity has come our international dependence on one another economically, the United Nations, the great industrial combines, British and American films shown the world over, and our increasing desire to travel further afield for holidays. Such diverse facts help to shape this age and to create an atmosphere favourable to united action. It would be strange if the Church was not influenced by this spirit of the age.

This is not to argue that church union is on a par with the amalgamations of big business, or that we should unite in order to mass-produce Bibles or theological students more efficiently and cheaply, but it is a plea that theologians should recognise both the Spirit of God and the spirit of the age. Such recognition is necessary if only to distinguish them.

For example it could be that co-operation between ministers of neighbouring churches of different denominations may be more possible because each has received his theological training at the same University and from the same tutors. On the other hand co-operation may be made harder since

[2]References to Penguin edition.

proximity has brought each church into rivalry with the other. Whatever agreements are made by theologians, the practical expression of their agreements will be influenced by facts like these.

These facts appear obvious, but many books on the nature of the Church, and papers on Church relations, emphasise the divine nature of the Church and forget that on earth she is a fellowship of fallible human beings. In discussing Church union the facts of sociology as well as of theology need to be studied. We need a close study of the Psychology of Church Life, as in other fields there have been studies of the Social Psychology of Industry.

This view has been held in the past. John Wesley found it necessary to distinguish the witness of the Spirit of God from that of our own spirit. (Sermons x, xi, xiv, etc.) He asked how to distinguish " this joint testimony of God's Spirit and our spirit from the presumption of a natural mind, and from the delusion of the devil." The Freudian ideas of the unconscious were foreshadowed by Jeremiah, " The heart is deceitful above all things...who can know it?" (*Jer.* xvii 9). This bias that leads us to declare our will as the will of God must be borne in mind in all interchurch discussions. A psychological study of martyrs and persecutors might be very revealing as to the unconscious motives that have played their part in theological development. That the Reformation in England was due to the marriage problems of Henry VIII is a gross exaggeration, but no student of the Reformation can ignore them.

Thought of the Church as a human society is not in favour today but it is in line with the revelation in the Bible. God spoke to the prophets in terms of their own age and in their own situation. Every revelation of God involves a measure of *kenosis*. It is limited by the capacity of the vehicle of His revelation.

Recollection of the two great heresies concerning the nature of Jesus may help us here. The earliest, Docetism, was so certain of His divinity that His manhood was denied. Some even said that His body was a phantom. To this day there are those who are horrified at the thought that Jesus was really hungry, needed to ask questions in order to know the facts of a situation, or was really a man of His own age. The second great heresy insisted that Jesus was truly man and at best a man who was raised to Divinity. With Rénan men still say " Jesus will not be surpassed—His worship will con-

tinually renew its youth," but He is a man even though the best of all possible men. Orthodox Christianity has insisted that each is true in what they assert and false in what they deny. He is BOTH human and divine.

Similar heresies arise when we think of the Church which is the body of Christ. There is a *kenosis* when the Holy Spirit fills the Church. The pages of the New Testament witness to the gift of the Holy Spirit and to the human limitations of spirit-filled men. The Church is a divine creation, she is also a human fellowship, and it is heresy to insist upon either truth to the exclusion of the other.

When we think of an indigenous church we recognise that here is a human society with a certain cultural background which will seek to worship God and to do His will within the context of its own culture and age.

It may be true to speak of the Church of South India as due to the activities of the Spirit of God, but we must find room for these activities in other areas beside the committee rooms of church leaders. The geographical situation whereby a Christian had no alternative but to be Methodist in one area and Congregationalist in another, and Church of England in a third, and the rising national consciousness were among the material factors that made union a matter of such supreme urgency.

Within our own country economic factors have brought about the closing of 'redundant' churches and an agreement between the major Free Churches regarding which shall build in new areas. The Church of England and the Roman Church are building great cathedrals in Liverpool. In the judgment of a writer in *Lancashire Life* (August, 1956) these will probably be the last great cathedrals built because of the high cost. It may be that economic pressure will lead to a wider use of laymen in the Church of England, and that in the Free Churches the ordained minister may have to undertake some other part-time employment. As the Holy Spirit guided the prophets by means of the historic situation of their time, He may guide us if we frankly recognise factors such as these. Church union because of financial stringency may still be the will of God.

A study of the reasons for denominational allegiance would probably reveal that for most people the acknowledged reasons are essentially non-theological. There is a movement into and out of the Church of Rome because of her attitude to mixed marriages. When a Roman Catholic 'turns' because a girl

refuses to be married in a Roman Church, he may sometimes enter into a real Christian experience and, so far as human judgments can go, become a convinced Christian member of a Free Church. It is foolish to ignore the dynamic motive.[3]

The main differences between the churches are in popular thought between Roman, High Church, Church and Chapel. They are differences like those between different nationalities which depend upon differences of speech. As we use different words for the same thing in different languages, so we sometimes say the same thing in different churches using different symbols. If on occasion a Free Churchman worships in a church of another tradition he is often impressed by the service as an Anglican is moved who shares in the worship of a Free Church. Such visits to other denominations are like holidays abroad, but for ordinary living we prefer the more familiar customs of home. It is for reasons such as these that many of us belong to the church of our childhood. There are theological barriers between denominations, but there are also the barriers of language, symbol and custom. There are deep philosophical differences between the British and the Russian peoples, the differences between 'Christianity' and 'Communism,' but the most obvious differences are of language and custom. If we shared a common philosophy there would still be suspicion depending upon a mutual strangeness.

The form of service, liturgical or extempore prayer, the wearing of vestments and even the design of the church building are the differences that are more obvious than theology. There is more distress over a Free Church convert to the Roman Church than over one to Christian Science or Spiritualism !

There have been Methodists who have left a village and on arrival in a town have joined the Congregational church because " we like a minister of our own." There has been no knowledge of the 'gathered church.' In the same way sometimes a Methodist local preacher has accepted the pastorate of a small church of the Congregational or Baptist communions, without any change in his theological views. A Baptist minister may take charge of a Congregational church without rejecting belief in believers' baptism. Other denominational changes take place for no other reason than that "it's nearer and we know some of the people who go." A Congregational church is without a minister and the pulpit is filled most Sundays by Methodist local preachers, while the local

[3] *cf.* John Tettermar, *I was a Monk*, p. 185.

Methodist circuit values the help given by one of the Congregational deacons in Methodist pulpits quarter by quarter.

In practice the theological barriers that loom so large in our discussions are ignored in local inter-church relations. The barriers that are present are often those created by the competition that exists between local churches. Sometimes they were even built in rivalry commemorated by their local nicknames ! In spite of real desire for co-operation our suppression of denominational emphasis has made neighbouring Free Churches rivals. The only justification for churches that are in practical competition is that each should serve a different section of society, present the gospel in a different way, or maintain a distinctive tradition.

In his moderatorial address to the Diamond Jubilee of the Free Church Federal Council Congress at Liverpool (*Cong. Quarterly* July, 1956) the Rev. K. L. Parry recalled an earlier thought of his that the secret of union might be discovered if we knew what kept the Church of England together and what keeps the Free Churches apart. The answer to these questions may be found by psychological or sociological study rather than by theology. The latter may only find unreal reasons for behaviour that the former has discovered and described.

For example the Church of England has a parish system. There is rivalry between 'high' and 'low' church and between preachers of varying shades of popularity, but the parish system sets limits to this rivalry and competition. Each Anglican church makes a primary appeal to a limited area and each parish priest has a primary responsibility for the people of that area. In contrast the Free Churches minister to a larger and more ill-defined area. The success of one Free Church is often at the expense of others in the same town. Co-operation between local Free Churches should lead to a distinctive witness from each and not to a loss of all that is distinctive. An emphasis, for example, upon a dignified and semi-liturgical service in one church should lead to a more " free and easy " type of service in the church in the next street. In other words neighbouring churches should supplement each other's ministry. This should not be because each holds that certain beliefs are right and others wrong but because of a frank recognition that people are different, and each is appealing to a distinctive section of society.

If on the other hand our acceptance of theories of church government, of episcopacy, of the priesthood of all believers,

of believers' baptism or of transubstantiation are sufficient to keep us apart then these doctrines should figure more prominently than they do in the preaching of the churches. It should not be possible for people to say, as they so frequently do, when they hear a Roman service on the radio, " it might have been a Methodist sermon." If we no longer emphasise our distinctive doctrines we have no right to use them to keep the churches apart.

So, too, if the historic situation which created the Free Churches is no longer present are we justified in maintaining an out-of-date witness ? On the other hand it may well be that our witness may be even more necessary because we have a new message for the new age in which we live. Such, for example, is the emphasis upon the social witness of the Free Churches which still expresses the once powerful Nonconformist conscience.

Until we face the real issues which divide us, the reason why Mr. A. goes to the Congregational and Mr. B. to the Methodist churches and Mr. C. stays away from them all, the discussions of the theologians will remain an interesting academic exercise. We already know that certain local churches were not founded to proclaim a distinctive Christian faith but to minister to a distinct group of people. Their origin was, in other words, sociological rather than theological. Their present maintenance is similarly a matter of practical economics rather than of loyalty to Christian truth. When this is more widely recognised Church union may be hastened and a co-operative spirit be more firmly created between the churches as each in its own way to its own kind of people preaches the gospel common to them all.

A NOTE ON *EPHESIANS* II. 1.

By Walter H. Denbow

The literal translation of *Ephesians* ii.1 is " And you who were dead in trespasses and sins." As the beginning of a chapter it is unmeaning, but it would be just as unmeaning had it been the end of chapter 1. Most translators think there is an ellipsis here, and supply accommodation words so as to make sense of it. The A.V. inserts " hath he quickened " as the action of the sentence. The R.V. turns it into " did he quicken." A modern translation makes a much longer journey of it and offers "To you who were spiritually dead all the time that you drifted along on the stream of this world's ideas of living." Here is another, " And as with us so with you. You were dead in the trespasses and sins in which you moved as you followed the course of this world." The most up-to-date gives us, " He found you dead men ; such were your transgressions, such were the sinful ways you lived in." There are two older modern translations, in which the same groping efforts are apparent. One gives us : " To you Gentiles also, who were dead through your offences and sins, which were once habitual to you . . ." Of all these modern instances, and others could be cited, there is one criticism, namely, it is not what Paul said or wished to convey.

There can be no doubt that the A.V. by inserting " hath he quickened " maintained the sense of the passage, but it is clear that by the time the translators had made the accommodation, the daring and vivid assertion which the Apostle makes in this Scripture, becomes as flat and uninteresting as a modern facade. This, however, is a criticism which must also be directed against the Apostle's literary style, for the obscurity with which the passage is afflicted is due to the presence of a long parenthesis by which a direct object becomes remote, making a continued assertion appear disconnected.

Let us consider the whole passage, beginning at i. 19. " . . . and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead. . . ." Here follows a most distracting parenthesis, full of Christological ideas, by which we are decoyed from what the Apostle had said to what he is saying. To add to our distraction we are brought to a chapter-ending at the conclusion

of the parenthesis, and a new chapter provides the suggestion of a new theme in " And you hath he quickened." Let us drop the parenthesis, and read the passage without it.

> " . . . and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and you who were dead in trespasses and sins."

" When He raised Him and you from the dead, you being dead in trespasses and sins." This is the assertion made by the Apostle, and no accommodation words are necessary. He declares the identity of divine power which God displayed when He raised Christ from the dead and those of us who were dead in trespasses and sins. The thought is continued in ii.5, " Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ." (The accusative υμας of ch. 2.1 belongs to εγειρας of ch. 1.20, and is in parallel to the αυτον of 1.20.)

Translators of this passage have provided interesting sidelights on the translator's difficulties, and in some important cases dislocative ideas have been adopted into *Ephesians* ii.1, as the best they can offer. There can be no doubt that unless the connection with 1.20 is recognised, there is no knowing what may come of " and you who were dead in trespasses and sins."

It is nearly impossible in public reading of this passage to communicate the direct thought of the Apostle if we include the parenthetical verses. The leap from the middle of 1.20 to ii.1 must be taken if we aim at intelligible reception of the reading. I am sure I have frequently done St. Paul good service in public reading by dropping verse 36 of *Romans* viii and passing directly from 35 to 37. That is easily and effectively done, but it is a much stiffer task to deal with this Ephesians digression. I do not think it can be done in public reading at all. It needs particular or homiletical treatment, for the idea that is presented to us is magnificent. It is nothing less than a miracle, comparable with Christ's resurrection, that we have been raised out of the death of our trespasses and sins. We have come forth from that death into newness of life only according to the working of His mighty power which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead. It is not only a matter of the love which sought us in our sins and rebellion, but the power, the mighty power, which made that love victorious. It is the work of " the Mighty God."

Conybeare and Howson are perhaps the most helpful among modern translators. They give us " And you likewise he raises from death to life when you are dead in trespasses and sins." That saving word 'likewise' carries us back to " when he raised him from the dead." Had our A.V. translators given us, " And you *also* who were dead in " etc. instead of the re-assertive " hath he quickened," there would have been no groping and the mighty would not have fallen.

There is, however, a somewhat noteworthy translation in the Rheims Testament. This work, fathered as it is by Jerome's Latin Vulgate, gives us the literal " And you, when you were dead in your offences and sins." Actually, the translation does justice to the Apostle by its literal nature, but I am not confident that the College at Rheims knew how accurate they were. It is different with Dr. David Smith in his *Life and Letters of St. Paul.* He, too, gives us the literal " And you, when you were dead through your trespasses and sins," but with every indication that the words are the completion of a disjointed sentence, and a pinnacle of divine triumph.

Knowing St. Paul as we do, we can recognise and appraise the difficulty that a man of his faith would have in passing quickly from the theme of Christ's glory at any time. He would linger to enlarge on the mighty power of God seen in the resurrection, exaltation, and ultimate triumph of Christ, but by the time he has come down from the mountain top, he has to think back to the point where he began to ascend. His readers are compelled to do the same, and are not able easily to find the point where the ascent began. All unwittingly he posed a test for reader and translator, for rightly rendered and understood it shows the Apostle in very forceful mood, and we see what conversion to Christ meant in terms of divine power.

> " That ye may know . . . what is the exceeding greatness of his power . . . which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead, and you, who were dead in trespasses and sins."

With this Gospel of power, Paul covered a great part of his world, and he came to know that a Gospel of less power than the mighty power of God has not a chance in a world like this.

THE CHURCH IN JAMAICA

By Frederick Pilkington

The first contact of Jamaica with the Church was through Columbus who thought of his expedition of exploration as a holy mission ; he transplanted Roman Catholicism when he renamed Xaymaca, Santa Iago, after a saint, and confessed concern for the conversion of the Arawak Indians, the original inhabitants of Jamaica. With Columbus sailed a priest, Las Casas, who spent many years in the West Indies, constantly appealed for decent treatment of Indians, and several times openly rebuked Columbus for the harsh treatment of them he permitted. Columbus declared his expedition was to extend Christianity because Islam had expanded in Europe (it reached the gates of Vienna) ; and because the Crusades had not liberated Palestine or restored it as a home for the Jews. In Europe the Church was disrupted and politics corrupt, but ideas of reformation were giving new vision and hope and the age was expectant for new revelations. New Christian lands were needed. Columbus, infected with the restlessness of the age, embarked to discover new lands which were to become Christian, and which Spain, by permission of the Pope, had annexed before they were discovered. Columbus's confessed sense of vocation to spread Christ's Kingdom was an ambition as difficult of interpretation as many other aspects of his character. Apparently he was a devout Christian, who read his daily office and navigated by biblical promise.

Las Casas reported that Columbus kept a journal, now lost, in which one entry made reference to the inhabitants of the islands he discovered. The journal was kept for the Queen, and in it Columbus wrote, " I maintain, Most Serene Princes, that if they (the Indians) had access to devout religious persons knowing the language, they would all turn Christian, and so I hope in our Lord that Your Highnesses will do something about it with much care, in order to turn to the Church so numerous a people, and to convert them, as you have destroyed those who would not confess the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." He also entered into that diary reasons why he undertook the expedition as a servant of God, and on an enforced rest at Baracoa wrote, " Your Highnesses ought not to consent that any foreigner do set foot here except Christian Catholics, since this was the end and the beginning of the enterprise, that it should be for the enhancement and glory

of the Christian religion, nor should anyone who is not a good Christian come to these partes." A further passage needs to be set against the background of what was then believed to be Islam's defeat of Christianity in Europe, and Columbus was overjoyed to have found islands to replace lost Christian territory: "Your Highnesses will win these lands, which are another world, and where Christianity will have so much enjoyment and our faith in time so great an increase." Columbus introduced the Catholic faith to the New World and some reason for the failure of a good response may be because, to use his own words, he "did not trust them (Indians)."

Jamaica, like other West Indian islands, came into the orbit of the Roman Catholic Church, but it was not a happy conjunction. Las Casas grieved over the development of what Columbus started as a holy mission. The Arawaks, who could have been easily converted, according to Columbus, because "they had no religion" neither did they "worship idols," were subjected to cruel treatment and were completely exterminated by the Spanish, who imported African slaves to replace them. Spiritual privileges may have been provided for European settlers, and perhaps African slaves, for it is interesting and curious to note that a Negro priest of the Roman Catholic Church was mentioned when the British captured the island in 1655. The Roman Catholic Church has many adherents today in the island, of which nearly half the total membership is resident in Kingston, but officially it does not appear ever to have been completely identified with the civic and social development of the island, though it has undertaken elementary and secondary education and conducted other charitable work, such as an orphanage and industrial school.

Protestantism was introduced to Jamaica through Cromwell who, for the spiritual welfare of an army which had caused many disappointments, had appointed seven chaplains with the force that took Jamaica, but they all died soon after the Conquest and it is uncertain what arrangements were then made for the spiritual welfare of the expeditionary force. Later a number of godly men gave religious instruction, and in 1675 an appeal was made for the appointment of ministers to cope with the spread of atheism.

In the years that followed the British conquest of 1655 the Anglican Church accomplished little, and since it was associated with the planting class, and thus identified with slavery, it

had little or no concern with Negro slaves. The clergy, like some of their brethren in England, conducted few services, gave no religious teaching, and were even hostile to the religious instruction of slaves, though for the work they did they enjoyed large incomes. The truth is that the job was too big for them, and they did not consider themselves called upon to assume any responsibility for the slaves. The few clergymen there were could not do justice to the people that needed care and attention. Twenty years after the Conquest there were only four clergymen in the island, and in the thirty years that followed the Conquest only nine churches were built. Several of the clergymen of those days were highly respected and honoured because of the integrity of their character. In these days the Anglican Church has redeemed the bad start it made, and tribute in this respect is due to the late Archbishop Nuttall, elected first Archbishop of the West Indies in 1897. Today the Anglican Church takes a worthy part in the service of the people along with other churches, but the position it now holds was made possible by the faithfulness of persecuted Evangelical missionaries in past days.

British Free Churches have a glorious record in Jamaica, and their work and influence in the days of slavery made possible the even temper of a nation that is descended from liberated slaves. They were, indeed, the only friends of the slaves, whom they encouraged to believe in the value of their own personality and whom they taught to read and trained for citizenship. It was due to the influence of those early missionaries that ex-slaves emerged into freedom with no greater demonstration than a cheer and a shout that, " the monster was dying . . .the monster is dead."

Free Church missionaries were very early in the field of Jamaica and carried with them the religious freedom won in England and in Germany. George Fox, founder of the Society of Friends, visited Jamaica several times from 1671, and though the extensive work done around Kingston for a time was allowed to lapse, in 1740 a meeting house was built. For the last sixty years the work of the Society of Friends has been controlled by the American society which has worked in schools and rendered excellent service at a special school in Highgate. The Quakers very early assumed responsibility for the education of the children, and of course were strong and courageous abolitionists.

That Nonconformist missionaries were not welcome is indicated by a letter of a Mr. Hanson in 1682 who wrote to a

friend in London, "we have very few papists or sectarians, for neither Jesuits or Non-conforming parsons do or can live amongst us. Some few have attempted, but never could gain proselytes enough to afford them substance." He wrote too soon and too hastily passed judgment, for not many years afterwards flourishing sectarian missionaries were established throughout the island, seeking to redeem neglected, despised and ill-treated slaves.

A Moravian mission has done good work since 1754. Moravians came to minister on German-owned sugar plantations, and though for a time their connection with the planting class limited their influence, their missionaries, who also worked at other occupations, in the first year baptised twenty-six slaves, and those were forerunners of greater numbers. The Moravian mission also became responsible for social and redemptive work that continues to the present time.

The first contact of Jamaica with British Free Churches was through the Wesleyan Methodist Church whose missionaries began work there in 1789 (later the Wesleyan mission accepted responsibility for the work of the United Free Methodist mission). Throughout the years Methodism has given distinguished and honourable service to Jamaica. The great missionary, Dr. Coke, thrice visited the island and sent two missionaries, one of whom died soon after arrival, and the other, William Hammett, left the island ; but others followed, and some who preached without a licence, taught slaves without permission, held services at unpermitted hours, were brought before magistrates, fined or imprisoned, wrongly accused, and despitefully used. In the early days there was a costly toll of life and not a few missionaries died after only a few months' service, or even after a few days. One missionary, Mr. Gilgrass, was imprisoned for a month as soon as he arrived on the pretence he had held an unauthorized service when he taught his friends new hymn tunes. The Methodist Church was from the beginning completely identified with the people, and now has its own overseas missionary enterprise in Panama, Costa Rica, Bocas-del-Tora, and the Valiente Indian Mission, and throughout Jamaica has elementary and secondary schools, training colleges, industrial centres, and is an integral part of the life of the island.

In 1806 the Baptists sent out missionaries to consolidate work already begun. The Baptist mission from the beginning made no compromise with slavery and they have a worthy story to tell in which the incident of William Knib, who was

tarred and feathered, is well known. They, too, are closely allied today with the island's life and are responsible for schools and colleges and numerous churches. The Baptist Union of Jamaica has extended its work to Cuba, Haiti, Bocas-del-Toro, and to Africa, especially Calabar.

The Scottish missionary society established in 1800 does a similar work and it is now of interest to recall that news of the sailing of their first missionaries for Jamaica was sent to a member of the Legislative Assembly, who at the first meeting of the Assembly in 1800 announced that he had been informed by a friend, a Mr. David Dick of Edinburgh, of the departure of missionaries ; but Mr. Dick did not know what doctrines they would preach except that they were anti-slavery missionaries whose advent to Jamaica was " pregnant with mischief to the colony." The missionaries were Rev. J. Bethune and two Catechists, Reed and Clark ; Clark died of yellow fever three days after he arrived and Bethune died of the same disease a few days later, and his wife and child, returning home, died on the way. The Presbyterian Church, which dates from 1823, accepted responsibility for the Scottish missionary society in 1847, and in 1900 became connected with the United Free Church of Scotland. The London Missionary Society started work in 1834 which is now connected with the Commonwealth Missionary Society, and though work was established in Jamaica about the time slavery was ending, it has a distinguished record and has played a great part in the island story.

British Free Churches, especially the Methodist and the Baptist, from the early days worked for the Negro : they were the friends of Negro slaves and have continued their work consistently to the present time. Slaves when they had the chance flocked to the societies where in a friendly fellowship they found a sense of human dignity even when they were still in bondage. They suffered, as did their missionaries, from the activities of the infamous Colonial Church Union, but in spite of opposition and persecutions retained their faith and zeal. The Free Churches made mistakes, and committees in England which sponsored some of them from time to time sent out commissions of enquiry, but there is no doubt that the several missions remained faithful to their service of the people and to the vision of the Kingdom of God.

It is impossible to trace, in this short article, how the vital history of the island is the record of the work of the Free Churches, whether in the establishment of schools and colleges, or in the organization of small holdings and agricultural

instruction for the best use of the land, or in building houses, or caring for the destitute and lost. In every national event these churches have guided the people, and it was due to their work that after emancipation freed slaves became a nation of free men and worthy citizens. The transition of the emancipation was as easy as it was because of Free Church influence. Lord Olivier, one time Governor of Jamaica, an able administrator and an unprejudiced observer, wrote " The fact cannot be ignored that the faith of the men, for the most part Evangelical Christian missionaries of the Free Churches, who laid the essential foundation for a peaceful development of the mixed community of Jamaica, was democratic and humanitarian, and before all else uncompromisingly Christian, and that not vaguely or loosely, in the sense of mere kindness, but in the sense of that revelation of the nature and inheritance of man which gave Christianity power to undermine the enormous brutalities and animalism of the Roman Empire." Modern Jamaica is built upon foundations laid by the missionary enterprise of the Free Churches.

In the background of modern Jamaica is the witness of those missionaries who, through slavery to emancipation and beyond, offered education, asserted elementary justice, declared for equality for all in the law courts, and fought for the right of humanity and fair play : and through the gospel message made the Negro aware of his sonship in God, taught him to assume responsibility in the Christian family and convinced him of the equality of black and white. People who were treated worse than beasts, forbidden to marry but commanded to have progeny, worked to death, miserably housed, denied elementary human rights, found hope and inspiration in the gospel and responded to the yearning of the Church that loved them, and through which they finally emerged as free people into a new world in complete possession of their souls.

What is the position today ? The country today could rightly be called at least nominally Christian. No other religion competes with Christianity. Secularism, materialism, indifference and, latterly, communism are as evident in Jamaica as in other countries, and new ideas ferment in the minds of the people. It must be remembered that there is now the third and fourth generation of a people with a Christian background and tradition. The work of the Church is needed as much today as any time in the past.

Ministers of all denominations are activated by a public

spirit, and some are members of the Legislative Assembly, others serve in local governments. There are representatives of the churches on the Board of Education and a number of ministers hold important public and executive posts, and most of them do a great deal of work as school managers on behalf of the Board of Education. All Churches share in the responsibility, and the Salvation Army too shares in the work through its own characteristic evangelistic and social expression. There are well over a thousand church buildings in the island, and missionaries from Britain work side by side with an indigenous ministry on equal terms. There is co-operation between all, and among some allied Churches there has been amalgamation ; a few principal denominations combine in specified work, especially in education. Church Union schemes are discussed but as yet have not been carried through. The day may not be too far distant when there will be union between at any rate some churches. The people of Jamaica are not interested in, nor do they appreciate, the differences which divide churches today, and reasons for separate existence which may have a historical basis in England, have no appeal to the Jamaicans. The people are humble, honest seekers for fellowship in the Church of Christ, and to them an Anglican Bishop has no greater authority or prestige than a Methodist Chairman or Scottish Moderator. The Church in Jamaica is almost entirely of the black and coloured people. The Christian witness and example of the white population is almost negligible ; there are, indeed, benevolent and philanthropic friends of the church among them and some who are deeply devoted Christians, but a definite identification of white people with church life would exercise a great influence, but at the moment in the religious life of Jamaica it is almost time to say they have become a liability. An achievement in Jamaica church life is the complete absence of any colour bar or prejudice ; white people who take their place in the church share all ordinances of church life with the black and coloured brethren with whom they break bread at the Communion Table. Any division there may be between white and black and coloured people arises from a cultural background and is not based on colour.

One further fact in an estimate of the church of Jamaica today which needs mention is the number of American societies that have established churches throughout the island. American missionary enterprise, as with many other aspects of American life, overflows with generosity ; but it is sometimes difficult to appreciate why in these days of tolerance

and when there are still areas in the world where pioneer work for the Gospel is still needed, American missions have been sent to an already evangelized country, where established churches are meeting the needs of the people. It has meant further disunity in the body of the Church and it is doubtful whether the incursion was a service to the people. Perhaps new missions are sent because it is thought that previous work has not been done properly and that there is a lack of emphasis on some obscure and unessential aspects of teaching.

Some American missions are of recent growth, but the first was started soon after emancipation. The " Christian Church " with its sub-title, " Disciples of Christ," was first started in Jamaica in 1858 and had for its object the aim of its parent body, that was, the union of all Christians in Christ. The Seventh Day Adventists still conduct an excellent vocational training school near Mandeville, which was established in 1894.

The daily press which announces Church Sunday services, as well as Anglican, Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Roman Catholic, Society of Friends, and Moravian, include many others, such as Seventh Day Adventists and, to add variety, the Seventh Day Baptists, and to be a little different again, the Seventh Day Christians; and the list includes the Baptist Convention of America, who are not the same people as the United Baptists, nor are these to be confused with the Free Baptists ; and to add to the confusion one church claims to be the Church of God and they are to be distinguished from the Church of God Assemblies. What all this medley means to the enquiring Negro is not to be known, and though every part may give reason for the separation, in the main, the explanations are little different from that given by a few Spanish Roman Catholics who, after the British Conquest, attributed the failure of the cocoa, introduced by the British, to the fact that the English were heretics.

Since the beginning of its history Jamaica has been inseparably connected with the Christian Church and today the problems which face the nation need the guidance of the Church strengthened by understanding and co-operation between all its branches. The Church, despite its division, is one and is capable of guiding the nation through the present transition to still greater freedom and responsibility.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea, a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

The name of the writer of two or more consecutive reviews is printed after the last one only.

THEOLOGY

AND RELEVANT STUDIES

Church Dogmatics. Vol. 1. The Doctrine of the Word of God. Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics. Part 2. By KARL BARTH. Editors, G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. Pp. xiv, 905. T. & T. Clark. 50s.

Here at last is an English translation of the second half-volume of Barth's *magnum opus*. In the German this stupendous work already runs to ten portentous tomes. It is over twenty years since the first instalment of the Prolegomena appeared in English, but it is good to hear that by the efforts of an industrious team of scholars practically the whole of Barth's work to date has now been translated. We are promised two half-volumes each year.

But what a work! Life is short and Barth is long. In the portly half-volume now before us there are nine hundred pages of concentrated theology. As in the German original, in the place of the usual footnotes and appendices there are interpolated in the texts chunks of subsidiary material printed in smaller type. These digressions or interludes vary in length from a few lines to several pages. They are not likely to be neglected by any reader who has once persuaded himself to sample them—for they often make the liveliest reading. And they bear witness to the well-nigh miraculous sweep and depth of Barth's theological erudition. The Bible, the Fathers, the Schoolmen, as well as later theologians, Catholic and Protestant, all are laid under contribution in a documentation which in itself might furnish us with the staple of a theological education. We used to say that Barth's *Church Dogmatics* was the most considerable theological landmark since Calvin's *Institutes*. But now the sheer bulk of Barth's encyclopædically-dimensioned work is making the *Institutes* look like a Bible Class Handbook, and already demands more shelf space than the *Summa Theologica* of Thomas Aquinas.

So much for size. As to content, "here's richness," as Mr. Squeers would have said. It is quite impossible for a short review to convey any adequate impression of the immense range of Barth's theological discussion, even as exemplified in this cross-section of it. Now that Barthianism is no longer in fashion, Barth's disciples and his critics will join in recognising him as the master theologian of our age, and the most potent

single influence in that revival of theology so fruitfully proceeding all round us. In this Church Dogmatics the prophet becomes the professor. The doughty fighter exchanges the broadsword for the scalpel; and how deft and delicate is his use of the instruments of theological dissection. Needless to say, Barth can be fully appreciated and constructively criticised only by those who will bring to the reading of his books the same patience and industry that have gone into the writing of them. Yet his handling of a theological topic is sufficiently complete in itself to be understood and enjoyed by those of us who, until we reach retiring age, are not likely to find time and opportunity to read Barth, as he ought to be read, from end to end.

It happens that the present half-volume is particularly rich in such discussions. There are, for example, the chapters on the Incarnation. For Barth Christian Dogmatics is fundamentally Christology, and as we read the illuminating treatment of the central dogma of our faith we understand more clearly why this is and must be so. Then there is a thoroughgoing exposition of the significance of the Virgin Birth, on which, as on other matters, Barth is at variance with Brunner. There is a most valuable digression, over seven pages of small print, on the history and dangers of the Roman Catholic 'excrescence' of Mariology. The theological significance of human religion is handled under the provocative title "The Revelation of God and the Abolition of Religion." Finally, the whole of the section "Holy Scripture" ought to be made compulsory reading for Modernists and Fundamentalists alike. In all, a book to be read and re-read. We look forward to its successors.

Approaches to God. By Jacques Maritain. 102 pp. Allen and Unwin. 8s. 6d.

A new work by Jacques Maritain is always an important event; this one, in the *World Perspective* Series, is as important and timely as any he has given us. It is a slender book, but the richness and value of its content is out of all proportion to its size.

In the opening chapter Maritain deals with what he calls the Primordial Way of Approach: Man's natural or prephilosophic knowledge of God, which he contends is given in our intuition of existence. This is not the *cogito, ergo sum* of Descartes. On the contrary, it is primarily an intuition of *things* as existing independently of me; then of my own existence as menaced by these and liable to death and nothingness; and then to some absolute existence completely free from nothingness and death. From this natural intuition arises a spontaneous reasoning from the Being-with-Nothingness, which is my own existence and that of the Universe of which I am a part, to the transcendent Self-existent Being-without-Nothingness, which is the existence of God. It is this natural knowledge of God which the "Five Ways" of Thomas Aquinas make articulate, and the second and longest chapter in the book is devoted to an exposition of the Five Ways and to the rebuttal of such criticisms and objections as may be levelled against them from the standpoint of our contemporary scientific view of the world.

This is the most valuable section of the book. Here we see Neo-Thomism tackling the metaphysical riddles propounded by the concepts of modern physics (e.g., "Suppose one should say that in the atom the electrons that turn around the nucleus are in motion without being moved by another thing. What is to be said in reply to that?"). Maritain then

proposes a "Sixth Way" of approach to God, which sets out from the "lived contradiction" between my temporary existence as a creature who is born and will die, and my spiritual existence as an intellect which in its activity of thinking transcends Time and must therefore have existed before my birth; not, it is true, in its "proper nature" but, so the argument concludes, as a thought in the mind of God. Chapters on The Way of Practical Intellect and on The Desire to see God, and a useful appendix of Thomist and other texts complete an argument which is stimulating and suggestive even where it is not completely convincing.

H. F. Lovell Cocks.

The Social and Political Philosophy of Jacques Maritain. Selected Readings by Joseph W. Evans and Leo R. Ward. 372 pp. Geoffrey Bles. 25s.

The Redemption of Thinking: A Study in the Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas. By Rudolf Steiner. Translated and edited with an Introduction by A. P. Shepherd and Mildred Robertson Nicoll. 191 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

Usually there is an unsatisfying incompleteness about selections or anthologies drawn from a man's work, unless it happens to be poetry. This, it might be thought, would be equally true of the work of so prolific a writer as Maritain; but it is not; for this volume gives less the impression of selected passages than of a single continuous work on the theme of Christian social and political philosophy. The selectors have done their work well, and it should be appreciated by those who have neither the time nor the opportunity to read the whole of Maritain's work but wish to have a good idea of what it is about.

Maritain was a convert first to Roman Catholicism and then to Thomism, which he believes to be the most satisfactory body of philosophy yet evolved. A non-Thomist might be pardoned if he finds the terminology of 'essence' and 'substance' strange; but apart from its obvious indebtedness to the Angelic Doctor Maritain's philosophy comes as a congenial and invigorating tonic in an era of *etatisme*, de-personalisation, sectional selfishness, and mass-mindedness. For the twin pillars of his social and political philosophy are respect for the human person and his rights and the priority of the common good as a regulative concept. He shares Berdyaev's concern for freedom, not in any abstract sense, but as the sum of concrete and positive freedoms embodied in social institutions. In his ideas of freedom and rights he is at variance with the general belief and practice of the Church to which he was converted; for when he says, as for example in a passage from *Man and the State*, that no religious pressure should be exercised by a (Christian) majority, and that, in a Christian state, "non-Christians' freedom to found their democractic beliefs on grounds different from those more generally accepted would be by no means jeopardised," he is enunciating a principle which in the religious field is universally denied by the Roman Church. As a Catholic, however, he has the advantage over the Protestant, for whereas the weakness of Protestantism is that there is no such thing as an integral Protestantism, there is an integral Catholicism, which, as Tillich has suggested, may be better equipped than is Protestantism to reintegrate the masses.

Maritain would share Berdyaev's horror at the dialectic development of humanism into its opposite, but he is a welcome antidote to those who in recent years have consistently disparaged any kind of humanism in the

name of biblical theology. Maritain finds in humanism the common ground on which the Christian and the non-Christian can meet. There is a " true humanism," and it is time for it to be reaffirmed in Christian theology and philosophy.

The late Dr. Rudolf Steiner, too, finds in the return to Thomism the way to the recovery of an integrative spiritual philosophy which is denied and required by the modern world, whose materialist-empirical outlook is, in Steiner's view, attributable to the influence of Descartes and Kant and to the denial that there can be no knowledge of the noumenal world. Of this volume of 187 pages, however, only 94 consist of the writings of Steiner himself—three lectures delivered in 1920 in the Goetheanum at Dornach (the institution which he himself founded) on " Thomas and Augustine," " The Essence of Thomism," and " Thomism in the Present Day." One might sum up Steiner's criticism of modern philosophy by saying that it has been too much concerned with epistemology and too little with gnosis. Far from being a crank with the ability to experience the supranormal, or the founder of an esoteric anthroposophy which was to embrace many realms of human activity (even the growing of tomatoes, if I remember rightly), Steiner was a man of wide and deep philosophical training, an experimental thinker, and one of the collaborators in the production of the great Weimar edition of Goethe. In these lectures printed in English for the first time Steiner seeks to bridge the gulf between man and the phenomenal and the noumenal worlds by means of a spiritual philosophy which is first Christian and then Scholastic. This, in his view, is the way to true gnosis. There is a valuable epilogue by the editors.

GERAINT V. JONES.

Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality. By PAUL TILLICH. x + 85 pp. Nisbet. 8s. 6d.

Here is a brief and lucid account of the tension between philosophical enquiry and biblically controlled theology. Philosophy, for Tillich, probes the mystery of being and tries to uncover the constitutive principles which are " always present if a thing participates in the power to be and to resist nonbeing." The attitude associated with this enquiry and the categories in which its finding are expressed are inappropriate, at first sight, for the task of articulating the insights of " biblical personalism." The inappropriateness is mapped soberly and clearly in cc. III—VI. But there is analogy of structure in the two intellectual tasks and the task of theology cannot be undertaken with complete indifference to that of ontological analysis and with complete repudiation of its language. This analogy is probed from the subjective side of biblical religion in c. VII and from the objective side (where concepts like creation, the Christ, the *eschaton*, are challenged by ontological considerations) in c. VIII. The analysis which precedes these two chapters is first-class and invites comparison with Gilson's *God and Philosophy*. The constructive work done in these two chapters is less masterly, though in the last section, *God as the ground of being in Ontology and Biblical Religion*, we are brought right to the heart of the matter. It is expressed, however, in Tillich-like aphorisms which require to be elaborated. " Faith comprises both itself and doubt of itself. The Christ is Jesus and the negation of Jesus. Biblical religion is the negation and the affirmation of ontology." W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

Christ and the Church, being the third part of a treatise on The Form of the Servant. By L. S. THORNTON. 151 pp. Dacre, 18s.

The Sacrifice of Christ. By C. F. D. Moule. 58 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 6s.

An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments. (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 17.) By Neville Clark. 96 pp. S.C.M., 8s.

The Strangeness of the Church. (The Christian Faith series.) By Daniel T. Jenkins. 188 pp. Gollancz, 12s. 6d.

Hardness of Heart. (The Christian Faith series.) By Edmond Cherbonnier. 188 pp. Gollancz, 12s. 6d.

The reviewer of Fr. Lionel Thornton's third part of his treatise on the Form of the Servant is intimidated by the judgments of Professor D. M. Mackinon and the present Archbishop of York, to which the publisher calls his attention, that this is likely to be one of the greatest Anglican theological works of the century. It is, of course, the work of an extremely able and a profoundly Christian mind ; and its theme is one of the greatest importance. It is an attempt to set forth in positive fashion how the great images of the Bible interact upon one another to reveal the greatness of the mystery that is in Christ. The truths to which the book witnesses are the great themes of the Gospel, which are no sectarian monopoly but are common to all Christians.

But until better advised, the reviewer, after a patient study of the book, has reluctantly come to the conclusion that this is not a legitimate way to use the Bible, nor is this the way to write. The book is more intelligible in some places than in others, but the reviewer would submit a paragraph from pp. 28-29 as typical of the kind of thinking which he finds difficult :

" In the story of Israel at the mount of God the tabernacle was set up on the level plain beneath the mount, whereas in the Gospel story the new tabernacle of transfigured humanity is seen, *not beneath but upon the mount* ; and this fact has a twofold significance. As we have seen, it foreshadows exaltation and glory to come through the mystery of death and resurrection. But, secondly, it also signifies the situation of the chosen witnesses who represent the new Israel. Like Moses and Elijah they have access to the presence of God ; but they find that presence now in the Shekinah glory of the beloved Son. Like Moses and Elijah, however, they find the presence upon the mount in detachment from the world below. Nevertheless Jesus himself entered the wilderness of this world ; and in the original story the mount is situated in the wilderness. It seems, therefore, that, although the place of access to the new tabernacle is 'on the mount' it may, from another point of view, be considered to be also 'in the wilderness.' When we pass from 'the wilderness' to the holy land the theme of 'the mount' undergoes a further development. 'The mountain of the Lord's house' at Jerusalem was alternately the centre upon which the prophets fixed their hopes and again the object of their despair. In the end our Lord referred to it as 'this mountain,' a mere obstruction to be removed by the power of unwavering faith." But readers who are more sympathetic to Fr. Thornton's mode of writing will find in the book a rich feast.

Professor Moule's small book on *The Sacrifice of Christ* must be warmly commended for its Christian charity, its lucidity and its sensitive and exact expression of the author's thought. In it he attempts to speak irenically to his fellow Anglicans about the relation between Holy Communion and the Cross of Christ. In it he has tried to formulate successfully first the Christian conviction of the absolute uniqueness and finality

of what God incarnate had done, and second the equally strong conviction that in a sense that final and completed act is not yet being implemented in the life of the Church which is the Body of Christ. Free Churchmen, who might want to stress the grace more than the sacrifice of Christ, might do worse than learn from the balance of Professor Moule's teaching.

Mr. Clark's contribution to the useful S.C.M. series of studies in Biblical Theology considers both baptism and the Lord's Supper because " it may be questioned whether a satisfactory theology of baptism may ever be arrived at except in conjunction with a reconsideration of eucharistic doctrine." The biblical study of baptism is extremely sensitive and perceptive, and all students will find it illuminating. The discussion of the Last Supper contains a sustained criticism of the arguments of Dr. A. J. B. Higgins in the same series, as well as a useful discussion of the relation between Agape and Eucharist.

Mr. Clark is no doubt right in wanting to study the two sacraments together, but this means that within the limits of space available in this series only limited attention can be given to each sacrament and to the relation between them. In his closing chapter Mr. Clark insists that in the New Testament, " baptism and the eucharist drive us back from their true understanding to other more central and pervasive doctrines, to christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology." This is true, but there are many other issues relevant to an adequate theology of the Sacraments for which Mr. Clark has no space. However, the book is to be welcomed as a valuable study of the New Testament data.

Professor Daniel Jenkins' latest book is simply and, in part, brilliantly written, and the reviewer found it most interesting. He has wondered, however, what audience the author had in mind. By its title it might seem to have been written for the outsider, who is unfamiliar with Church ways, but this is hardly true, as this is a highly reflective study of what the Church ought to be doing. It is, in fact, Professor Jenkins' statement of the theology of the Church. The reviewer missed in the book the transmission of the author's perception of what being a member of the Church means to the majority of those who are members, and he was at times disconcerted by the author's apparent inability to distinguish between the times when he is illuminating the subject that he is discussing, to the great profit of his readers, and the times when he is propounding Biblical and theological formulae, which may ultimately be entirely satisfactory, but which do not, as he uses them, make the issue clear. But the book is exceedingly interesting, and it provides admirable material for discussion by ministers' fraternals who would find the book profitable, not only when they found Professor Jenkins' views helpful, but also when they found them infuriating.

The reviewer would warmly commend Professor E. La B. Cherbonnier's *Hardness of Heart*, a contemporary interpretation of the doctrine of sin. The thesis which Professor Cherbonnier propounds is simple. " Historically," he says, " all such definitions have fallen under one of two main headings : the moralistic view, which regards sin as the violation of given rules and standards [this view he associates with the name of Pelagius], and the dismal conception of sin as some intrinsic defect in human nature " [this view he associates with the name of St. Augustine]. " According to the Bible, sin is properly defined as misplaced allegiance or, to use its technical word for it, idolatry."

This seems a satisfying thesis to propound, particularly at the present

day, when in reaction against a too superficial conception of sin, we have come near to making sin inevitable and the fact of it a joyful part of the Gospel. Professor Cherbonnier writes in clear and intelligible English on the basis of a very adequate scholarship. His conclusion is: "The redemption which the Church offers to all men is deliverance from bondage to the idols which have blinded and enslaved them. It liberates by conferring upon them the one thing which they can scarcely acquire by effort, *agape*. It therefore hastens the fulfilment of God's ancient promise 'I will give you a heart of flesh'." H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

The Old Testament in Modern Research. By HERBERT F. HAHN. 267 + vii pp. S.C.M. 16s.

This is a first-class piece of work, providing an accurate survey of modern writings on the Old Testament. It is a fine example of assimilation and condensation. The author has concentrated on the more important issues in the realm of O.T. study and has been successful in providing a balanced account of what is happening. In seven chapters, Hahn discusses the several ways in which the O.T. is being approached in these days. He begins, naturally, with the positions established by Wellhausen and his school. From there he proceeds to discuss the alterations that have taken place within the framework characteristic of that school. Then there follow chapters on other approaches to the O.T., viz. Anthropological, Religio-historical, Form-critical, Sociological, Archaeological, and finally, Theological. There are also a brief Introduction and a useful Summary. The author has an intimate knowledge both of American and European writings. But the book is no mere series of neat summaries of other men's writings. For example, in his treatment of the important Scandinavian School there is a careful critical evaluation of its work. His fairly lengthy discussion on Gunkel's work, too, is most useful.

This is the kind of book that needs to be written. It gives the kind of report the scholar needs from time to time; it tidies up the mind of the more general reader of the O.T.; and it brings into focus the questions which really matter in O.T. work.

Canaanite Myths and Legends. By G. R. DRIVER. 169 pp. T. & T. Clark. 25s.

This volume is No. 3 in "Old Testament Studies." It is based on lectures delivered over the last ten years and makes available the latest results on Canaanite myths and legends from Ugarit (or Ras Shamra).

The Introduction tells of the discovery of the tablets in 1928. The tablets bring a whole civilisation to light. They cover very many subjects, literary, religious, civic, medical, commercial, etc. Several languages are represented among them, Accadian, Hurrian, Sumerian and Ugaritic. They are dated between 15th and 12th centuries B.C.

The texts in this volume are the poems. Driver provides an analysis of their contents. This is an important contribution to understanding them. For in order to supply an analysis it is necessary to create some kind of order among the tablets and also to translate them. Whereas many years of research still lie ahead, yet even at this stage, Driver's work forms a contribution to the understanding of O.T. religion. To mention one example, the three fragmentary tablets dealing with the myth of the 'Rephaim' show the persistence of ancient heathen concep-

tions in the O.T. idea of Sheol. Much light, too, is shed on the Hebrew idea of Kingship.

The book is full of good things for the student of the O.T. There is an English translation, set in parallel columns with the transliterated text. For the Semitic philologist there is an important section on 'Observations.' The work is completed with a 'Glossary' of roots, enriched by numerous notes, indicating parallels with other Semitic languages.

Despite all the technical apparatus, the book can be read and enjoyed by the non-specialist. Its price is reasonable and it is sponsored by the Society for Old Testament Study.

Early Israel in Recent History Writing. By JOHN BRIGHT. 128 pp. S.C.M. 9s. 6d.

This is No. 19 in the series "Studies in Biblical Theology." Prof. Bright seeks to find a method whereby to evaluate the early traditions of Israel. He realizes that it is important for historical scholarship and theology that the events related in the Hexateuch should be clearly understood. These events have been recorded because of the nature of Israel's faith and interpreted in its light. Not to be clear about the nature of that early history is to be open to error in the interpretation of the later history. He discusses in detail the teaching of Alt and Noth on the history and that of the Jewish scholar Kaufmann on the religion. This part of the book makes accessible what is otherwise not accessible to English readers.

Bright agrees that the main problem is one of evaluation of the data, rather than what he calls "the field of evidence." He offers a judicious and constructive estimate of the work of the scholars mentioned. His own contribution, a really important one, is a scholarly handling of archaeological findings and literary analysis. He is able to avoid the extremes of credulity and scepticism. The value of the book for ministers and students is that it demonstrates how modern Christian scholarship leads on to a truer picture of how God has acted in the history of Israel.

The Messianic Idea in Israel. By JOSEPH KLAUSNER. 543 pp. Allen & Unwin. 30s.

This work is a translation by Prof. Stinespring from the third Hebrew edition. The idea of the Messiah is traced throughout the Old Testament, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and in the Tannaitic Period.

Klausner claims that Israel gave three great gifts to mankind—monotheism, morality, and prophecy. To these a fourth requires to be added : belief in the Messiah. The point of view of Klausner is expressed in the closing sentence of the second chapter : "Truly the Messianic idea is the most glistening jewel in the glorious crown of Judaism."

As a source-book of the Messianic idea this work is indispensible. The idea is examined in all its varying aspects, in different eras, and with its developing significance. Although it is possible to maintain that the idea may be mythical in its remote origins, Klausner, rightly, asserts that the idea we have to deal with today is one that has come into being as the result of the prophetic influences which have played upon it. It is due to the work of the prophets that the Messianic idea provides a living hope for mankind today. Klausner criticises both Jews and Christians for finding the Messianic idea where it does not occur, e.g. Gen. 3.14-15. He claims that frequently there is a confusion between a genuinely messianic passage

and what is simply an interpretation supplied by the reader. This fault he finds, too, in the Talmudic literature. Nevertheless, he sees clearly, that even a subjective 'interpretation' exerts its influence, and in some measure, determines the development of the genuine messianic idea. He notes differences in what might be called the 'Messianic-pattern.' Zechariah, e.g., conforms to the pattern : Sin—punishment—repentance—redemption ; but Ezekiel to the pattern : Sin—punishment—redemption—repentance.

Despite the wealth of detail and erudition, the book fails to satisfy. Paradoxically, the great significance of the Messianic idea, for both Jew and Christian, is not really brought out. Klausner too closely relates the Messianic idea to progress. It is not quite adequate to end the survey of so exalted a theme with " Therefore, we can say, without being suspected of undue bias towards Judaism, that the Jewish Messianic faith is the seed of progress, which has been planted by Judaism throughout the whole world." Such a conclusion raises the question : is it possible to write adequately about the Messianic idea and at the same time, more or less, ignore the New Testament ?

The Messiah in the Old Testament. By HELMER RINGGREN. 71 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

This is No. 18 in the series " Studies in Biblical Theology." It represents what is known as the Scandinavian School. In five chapters Ringgren discusses " The Royal Psalms," " Messianic Prophecies," " The Servant," and concludes with " Is the Servant the Messiah ? " He is fully aware of the unity in theological ideas between the two testaments. He examines the idea of Kingship, and shows how closely it is related both to the idea of the Servant and the hope of the Messiah. His presentation is persuasive but not absolutely convincing.

A number of questions arise which demand further discussion. First, in dealing with Ps. 8, Ringgren suggests that 'man' as used there should be applied to the king. But is that necessarily so, and does it apply throughout the Psalm ? Again, did ancient Israel believe that the king " played the role of Adam as the representative of mankind " ? The claim seems too abstract.

Ringgren's work shows a careful handling of such topics as " Enthronement Psalms " and " Cult and Ritual Patterns." He deserves praise for the valuable discussion wherein he links the thought-world of the Ancient East to the Coming of Jesus : " Ancient religious language expressed religious ideas in the form of myth. The Greeks proceeded from *mythos* to *logos*, from myth to abstract thinking and ideas ; in the Bible there is another way : the Word became flesh, . . ."

The Qumran Community. By CHARLES T. FRITSCH. 147 pp. Macmillan : New York and London. $3.25 and 23s.

This is an account of the history of the Qumran Community and its literature. The book is a safe guide, even if sober in style. The photographs are very good and of a reasonable size. The author has gleaned wisely in many fields and has visited Qumran. The result is a well-ordered book, particularly strong in the historical background it sketches.

Those who have read more than a 'Pelican' on the subject may the better appreciate some of the qualities of the book but at some points be critical of it. One merit of the author is his careful quotations from the

Scrolls. Another is his deft use of lengthy extracts from Josephus, which bring the life of the Community into relation to the main stream of Jewish history. Further, he tries to relate the life and literature of the Community to questions which will be of interest to the Christian reader. In this last connection, Fritsch discusses the relation of the Community to the Damascus Sect, the Essenes, and John the Baptist. Also he deals with the Gospel of John, Paul, the Last Supper, and Jesus.

However, at one or two points, Fritsch makes 'guesses' which are not convincing. For example, is it wise to suggest that Origen himself removed some of the Scrolls from the caves? Also, what value can be placed on the assertion that the " Messianic consciousness " of Jesus " was strongly influenced by their interpretation of the Old Testament Prophets "? On the whole, Fritsch seems to claim too much on behalf of the Community and is too ready to identify it with the Essenes. The term 'Essene' itself requires very careful definition in this connection, and more work remains to be done on it. Otherwise the book is quite a useful guide on the subject. JAMES WOOD.

Everyday Life in Old Testament Times. By E. W. Heaton. 240 pp. Batsford. 15s.

Canon Heaton states his aim as having " tried to write for all who are interested in the Old Testament (except, of course, the learned) " (p. 9). The proviso is scarcely necessary, for there is no lack of scholarship in the book. It is a sound survey of Old Testament antiquities, using both the Old Testament itself and recent archaeological discovery. One may at times think it dangerous to assume Assyrian practice, for example, was parallelled in Hebrew where we have no direct evidence, but there are no wild guesses, and the author's conjectures are all highly probable. His professed aim of producing a popular book allows him to dispense with learned footnotes, which makes for easier reading, and indeed the book is easy to read in the author's popular style, which at times becomes colloquial, as on p. 70 : " It didn't prevent Jacob from falling for Rachael at first sight when they met at the well." He has produced a very interesting book, particularly for the non-specialist; his 'conducted tour' of the Temple (pp. 222-228) gives as vivid an impression of what the place was like as can be seen anywhere. The illustrations by Marjorie Quennell (126 of them) are good, and illustrative of the text—the only complaint is that they are usually rather far from the relevant passage, which is a nuisance in looking for a figure only referred to by a number. The reference to Fig. 16 on p. 34 seems misplaced.

Hebrew Man. By LUDWIG KÖHLER. 189 pp. S.C.M. 12s. 6d.

These are lectures delivered at Tübingen three years ago, with the author's Rectorial Address at Zürich delivered in 1931 as an Appendix. This is not so irrelevant as it might seem, since the subject of " Justice in the Gate " follows naturally on the closing topic of the last lecture, namely 'righteousness' as an element in Hebrew consciousness. The book sets out to describe those background elements of the Old Testament—e.g., the physique of the Hebrew, his expectation of life, the way he thought—which the reader of the Hebrew Scriptures normally overlooks in seeking the religious revelation. Yet such form the raw materials of the life through which the revelation came and are not unimportant for the clearer understanding of it. The evidence is in fact meagre, and Prof. Köhler has marshalled it in adequate and convenient form, here and there throw-

ing light on matters which one had not previously considered, as in his indication of how *Proverbs* originated in the form we have it (pp. 104-7). His suggestion in the Appendix (pp. 158-163) on the form of *Job* as reflecting the practice of the 'legal assembly' at the village gate, fresh when first propounded, has not found favour in subsequent scholarship, but is worthy of consideration. It appears here for the first time in English. The translation by Peter R. Ackroyd flows freely; there are no obvious 'Germanisms,' and he is to be congratulated on producing a translation which reads like an original work. A. M. Price.

Tales of the Hasidim. The Early Masters. By Martin Buber. xviii + 335 pp. Thames and Hudson. 18s.

Hasidism is the popular mystical movement which, despite persecution at the hands of traditional Rabbinism, spread rapidly through East European Jewry, beginning in 18th century Poland. It is interesting to note that the Pietism of Protestant Germany, under Spener and Francke, also reached its zenith about this time. The founder of Hasidism, Rabbi Israel ben Eliezer (1700-60), more commonly known as the Baal-Shem-Tov, Master of the Good Name (of God), exalting devotion and simplicity above mere scholarship, gathered about him a group of disciples who in their turn became *zaddikim* (those who stood the test), attracting to themselves communities of the pious (*hasidim*). Their teaching stressed piety, love of God and one's neighbour, and joy in God's creation. It preserved the messianic fervour of the people, wooing it away from the future to a love of God and man in the present, showing men the way to God who "dwells with them 'in the midst of their uncleannesses,' a way which issues forth from every temptation, even from every sin." It taught that the present moment is itself the moment of redemption. Hasidism is one of the strains converging in the thought of Martin Buber who has selected here legends concerning the first three generations of *zaddikim*. They appear before us as living characters whose wisdom and fervour spring directly out of an awareness of God. The introductory essay and a glossary of Hebrew terms enlarge both the usefulness of a finely produced book and the possibility of sharing in a notable and formative religious impulse.

Conrad Bonifazi.

St. John's Gospel: A Commentary. By R. H. Lightfoot, edited by C. F. Evans. 368 + xii pp. Clarendon Press. 30s.

Commentaries and studies upon the Fourth Gospel never cease to pour from the press; there is no part of the New Testament which has received such loving and detailed study. Recently some very important books have emerged (notably those by C. H. Dodd and C. K. Barrett) and here is still another which, within its self-imposed limits, is entitled to rank high. The volume began as an attempt to fill the gap in the Clarendon Bible and to provide a commentary on John. It outgrew its size so that R. H. Lightfoot then planned to make it similar, at least in outward form, to his *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*. When he died, the commentary proper was completed for publication but the Introduction consisted of a number of separate studies. C. F. Evans has woven them together and seen the whole through the press. It now forms a book of first-rate interest and value.

The author is not unduly concerned with the "by whom, to whom, when, where, and why" of the writing of the Gospel, though he does not neglect these. He concentrates instead on a kind of running commentary.

The text of the Revised Version is printed; the commentary is divided into seven sections, the first one dealing with the Prologue or Introduction (which takes in ii.1-11 as well as i.). In the other six sections a consistent and successful attempt is made to show that the Gospel is a compact and very closely woven unity in which the evangelist is always concerned to convey a deeper significance to everything that happens and to keep the Lord's death and exaltation in mind, explicitly or implicitly, in every section. It becomes clear that the evangelist was intent on showing the relation between the word and the work of the Lord Jesus, that he meant each section to correspond closely with the others, and each to contain in itself the whole Gospel in germ.

It is a book of wide scholarship (as for example in its knowledge of what others have written and in its careful examination of words and ideas); it is written with lucidity and is easy to read; it is full of spiritual insights (as for example in the exposition of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles and in the appended note on "The Lord the true Passover feast"). It is emphatically a book to be acquired and mastered.

W. Gordon Robinson.

The Historical Jesus by L. A. Garrard (Lindsey, 2s.) reminds us of how the publication of Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* in 1906 disturbed both Liberal and Conservative theologians. Mr. Garrard is indignant at the way in which some conservatives have taken Schweitzer's argument that the historical Jesus is a figure impossible to reconstruct as a reason for filling the lacuna with dogma. He himself believes the historical Jesus is still the main goal of Biblical study. But he cares little about the answer 'realised' eschatology has given to the 'thorough-going' eschatology of Schweitzer. And when he refers to the Johannine re-interpretation as "distorting the facts" this only shows up the narrowness of the limits within which his criticism moves. This critical approach can hardly get to the centre of N.T. affirmation or see the full truth about Christ.

Galilean Christianity. By L. E. Elliott-Binns. 80 pp. S.C.M. (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 16). 7s. 6d.

It is an unwarranted assumption that the original disciples in Galilee gave up their belief when the post-Resurrection Church made its head-quarters in Jerusalem. This book is an attempt to reconstruct what was distinctive of the Galilean type of Christianity which the author of Acts ignored. Careful reading of the Gospels shows differences between Galilee and Jerusalem, but this is hardly sufficient to give a clear notion of what Jesus's Galilean adherents believed as contrasted with those in Jerusalem. But Dr. Elliott-Binns further makes use of the Epistle of James, which he assumes to be representative of Galilean Christianity, and on this evidence the basic faith of the Galilean Church appears as Jewish moralism, an interest in the teaching of the Lord Jesus but not in his life, Person or atoning death. The theory that James was addressed to Galileans is not impossible, even if it falls short of proof. It involves regarding the opening verse as a later addition, and of course denies the traditional view that the author was James of Jerusalem. A further suggestion of Dr. Elliott-Binns is that the Galilean Christians were the origin of the mysterious sect of Ebionites who are referred to by 2nd century writers as heretics, and who appear to have seen in Jesus an opponent of the sacrificial system.

The Epistle to the Romans. By VINCENT TAYLOR. 100 pp. Epworth Press. 8s. 6d.

This volume is the first of a new series from the Epworth Press. The aim is to help "preachers and particularly those who feel themselves ill-equipped to study the more advanced works of scholarship." We have 8 pages of Introduction and 80 pages of commentary, all very much to the point. A notable feature are the summaries before each section of the Epistle, and the suggestions on the method of presenting it to a modern congregation. Dr. Taylor is not afraid to say what he considers relevant, and what not. He has in mind "those who are tired of trivial themes and wish to examine the central truths of the Gospel."

The Key to Ephesians. By E. J. GOODSPEED. xvi + 75 pp. C.U.P. 19s.

This volume is the latest statement of Prof. Goodspeed's theory that all the other Pauline epistles are echoed in Ephesians, in fact supply almost the whole of its material except for a few lines of Acts and LXX. This is incontrovertible. The full comparison of Ephesians with tho other Paulines on which the theory is based is here set out in the English of the American version of 1901. The theory goes a step further when Goodspeed argues that no other N.T. writings earlier than 90 A.D.—not even Acts—show the influence of the Pauline Epistles. It is then suggested that (a) the letters had not been collected before that date; (b) it was the publication of Acts which prompted some Paulinist to make such a collection; (c) this Paulinist composed Ephesians himself as both a preface to the Corpus, and as an application of the main Pauline themes to the circumstances of the Christian world 30-40 years after their original composition. This is not so certain, and depends on the late dating of I Peter, Hebrews and Revelation which not all scholars accept. But it throws light on conditions in Asia Minor between 60 and 90 A.D. The onus of proof that the Paulines were in circulation during those years is placed by Goodspeed on his critics; he holds that they were so unflattering to their recipients that "a generation had to pass before they could decently be published." (See also review of *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus*, by C. L. Mitton, in the April number of this Quarterly.)

The Early Church. By OSCAR CULLMANN. Translated by A. J. B. Higgins and S. Godman, and edited by A. J. B. Higgins. 217 pp. S.C.M. 25s.

This volume contains ten essays by Prof. Cullmann on the following subjects: The Necessity of Higher Criticism, The Origin of Christmas, The Plurality of the Gospels, The Tradition, The Kingship of Christ and the Church, The Return of Christ, The proleptic deliverance of the body, "He that cometh after Me," Samaria and the origins of the Christian Mission, Early Christianity and Civilisation. The author's forcefulness and insight into underlying facts as he handles early Christian documents are very satisfying in spite of his somewhat pontifical manner, and we may be grateful to Dr. Higgins for providing this further opportunity of studying his work. The outstanding essays are those on Tradition and The Kingship of Christ, and we shall confine our comments to these.

Prof. Cullmann shows that in the N.T. the apostolic tradition or Kerygma was regarded as deriving from the Lord Himself, who was controlling the transmission, witnessing to Himself and thus taking the place for His followers of what Jews knew as the tradition of the Torah.

In the 2nd century this led to the fixation of the N.T. Canon as those writings which conserve the apostolic witness for all subsequent generations. This apostolic tradition is not to be equated (as in Roman Catholicism) with ecclesiastical tradition, but is the norm by which all later tradition must be tested. This is powerfully argued and based on thorough exegesis of the relevant texts. But it leaves no room for distinction between the revelation in the acts of the incarnate Christ and the transmission in the Church. " This period of the Church is part of the history of salvation " writes Cullmann. There is a truth here, but to put it in this way obscures the uniqueness of Christ. We need a firmer line of demarcation between Christ and the Apostles, as well as between Apostles and Church. Only when that is properly drawn can we agree that " the apostolate does not belong to the period of the Church, but to that of the incarnation."

Cullmann distinguishes the Kingdom of Christ from the Kingdom of God. Christ's Kingdom began with the Ascension and will end with the Second Coming and Millenium. It means the present Lordship of the Risen Christ over all creation, not realised by the majority but nevertheless a fact. Coterminous with it, or even in some sense the centre of it, is the Church, i.e. those who are conscious of Christ as Lord and know the significance of His death and resurrection. Thus both Church and *Regnum Christi* belong to the same period of time, viz. the centuries from the Resurrection onwards, and in this are contrasted with the Kingdom of God which means the final consummation. Cullmann's combination of passages from different N.T. authors strikes us sometimes in this chapter as uncritical. Moreover, he makes no reference to the interpretation of the Kingdom of God as not entirely future but as 'realised' in the ministry of Jesus. This omission is noticeable both in this essay and in the one on The Return of Christ. English students can only hope one day to have Prof. Cullmann's judgment on this point.

Codex Climaci Rescriptus Graecus. By Ian Moir. 117 pp. and 8 plates. C.U.P. 30s.

John Climacus, Abbot of St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai, wrote two Syriac treatises on top of some Syriac and Greek writing, and the codex containing this is now in the Library of Westminster College, Cambridge. Dr. Moir with the aid of modern photographic methods has deciphered the underlying Greek, which has some features unique among Biblical documents. It is an attempt to give a synopsis of the Gospel text, though not certainly for more than the Passion narrative ; but it is not a harmony (as Mrs. Lewis thought when she published part of it in 1909) nor is it a lectionary. Outside the Passion section it offers an unusual selection of excerpts from Matthew and John written as a continuous text. Dr. Moir dates the MS. 650-700 A.D. The text is mainly Byzantine, but there are non-Byzantine readings, some of which suggest a connection with Codex Bezae, and in Mark Dr. Moir regards it as Cæsarean.

This book is a work for specialists in Textual Criticism. Dr. Moir is to be congratulated on this first work. E. C. Blackman.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

What is Vital in Religion. By H. E. Fosdick. 238 pp. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Fosdick, through his long ministry at Riverside Church, New York and even more widely through his books has been the teacher of thousands in the meaning of Christian faith and life. Now he has published his last volume of sermons. If it is indeed his last, the world will be the poorer because he speaks no more. The Christian liberalism, of which he has been a consistent exponent all his life, is here seen at its best. While some of his readers will no doubt disagree with some of the things he says, none can disagree with the spirit in which he says them. It is interesting to find that he has come to see more in orthodoxy than once he did. For instance, he writes on p. 179, "I am not a cynic, but I am much more realistic about man that I used to be. Man is a sinner; there is truth in that old doctrine of original sin." In this book Dr. Fosdick has given us the ripe fruit of a mature Christian mind. The faith, quality and readableness of these sermons held my attention to the end.

Some Christian Words. By W. R. Matthews. 96 pp. Allen & Unwin. 7s. 6d.

He who would commend the Christian faith today is faced by a two-fold difficulty. In the first place the very ideas of sin and salvation, heaven and hell, are strange to the modern man; in the second place the words in which the ideas must be conveyed are more or less meaningless to his hearers. Dr. Matthews, therefore, has done a useful service in publishing 12 broadcast talks in which he explains some of the key words of the Christian faith in terms which the Home Service listener can understand. He has also added for full measure three valuable talks on "Jesus' Thought about Himself." This book is a pleasure to read. Dr. Matthews' thought is incisive and his style clear and graceful. Both minister and layman will find it most valuable.

Thine is the Kingdom. By James S. Stewart. 74 pp. St. Andrews Press. 7s. 6d.

This book has a value out of all proportion to its size. Professor Stewart sees two fundamental factors in the missionary motive, namely, the constraint of Christ upon the individual and the kingship of Christ over history. The Church's business is not to help Christ to become King, but to proclaim the Kingship which God has already given Him. "Behind the imperative lies an indicative. The Church must act because God has acted already." This is an exciting little book written in simple vigorous English. It cannot fail to stir up those who read it.

An Approach to Christian Education. A Symposium edited by Rupert E. Davies. 59 pp. Epworth. 12s. 6d.

A distinguished group of University and public school teachers have attempted in this book to work out a Christian understanding of education, and to examine in its light the subjects with which they deal. Dr. C. A. Coulson, Rouse Ball Professor of Mathematics in the University of Oxford,

and Dr. H. H. Swinnerton have contributed outstanding essays in which they relate the teaching of science to a Christian scheme of education. Dr. Coulson quotes with approval Sir Lawrence Bragg's classic statement about scientific discovery as a form of revelation. Dr. Swinnerton emphasizes the importance of the assumption regarding the unity of the world which underlies all scientific research. These essays should set the Christian thinking again about science and religion with a view to further conversation with the scientific humanist. In addition, Science, History, Mathematics, Classics, Literature, Modern Languages and Divinity are each dealt with by well-known teachers of these subjects. Each essayist manages to say something worth while. Many besides parsons and schoolmasters would profit by reading this thought-provoking book.

Peace with God. By BILLY GRAHAM. 207 pp. World's Work. 3s. 6d.

The Secret of Happiness. By BILLY GRAHAM. 166 pp. World's Work. 10s. 6d.

In the first of these books Billy Graham sets out his understanding of the main doctrines of the Christian faith, and in the second he reflects upon the basis and nature of happiness as revealed in the Sermon on the Mount. No one who reads them will be in any doubt as to the author's sincerity and passionate devotion to Christ. He has a splendid conception of the nature and purpose of God. Even in print he is able to convey such a sense of the Divine Holiness and Love that one begins to understand something of the secret of the power which he exercises over millions. The chapter in " Peace with God " on why Jesus came is splendid and moving. Whatever may be one's criticism of some of the details the strength of this book is in its setting out of a coherent system of belief with God's redeeming act in Christ at the centre. More's the pity that the author still holds a very literalistic view of the Bible. For instance, he writes on p. 33, " Adam was created full-grown with every mental and physical faculty developed." This failure to bring to the Bible the insights gained in other fields of study is a serious defect in one to whom so many look as a religious teacher.

Much in " The Secret of Happiness " is valuable, but I did not feel that Dr. Graham really got at the true inwardness of the Sermon on the Mount. Too often he used a Beatitude as a peg on which to hang his own reflections, instead of exploring what Christ meant.

In **The Gift of Pentecost** (Parry Jackman, 6s. 6d.) Herbert Lockyer makes a comprehensive collection of references to the Holy Spirit, both from the Old Testament and the New. His aim is to prove the personal nature of the Spirit, and His important place in the Bible and in the life of the Christian. This book would have been more valuable if the author had approached the Bible with more of a historical sense than he reveals in his method.

The character of mass evangelism today has started controversy again as to the nature of the Bible. In **Fundamentalism and Evangelism** (Crusade, 1s.) J. R. W. Stott has set out to justify the standpoint of the conservative evangelical. Although he repudiates the rejection of all criticism and a mechanical view of inspiration, he nevertheless argues that because Jesus quoted the Old Testament " the authority of Christ and the authority of the Bible stand or fall together." He does not really come to

grips with the problem of how the words and acts of men can convey the Word of God.

Radio and television have for a long time exploited the appeal of family life in features whose titles have become household words. In **The Jessop Family** (Epworth, 1s. 6d.) Kathleen Start and Mary Gilson have used a similar technique to provide material for discussion in Young Wives' Groups. Leaders who use this booklet will ensure that a good time is had by all, and that real benefit will accrue to some.

Power to Become. By Lewis L. Dunnington. 233 pp. Macmillan (New York and London). 20s. 6d.

This book alternately fascinated and repelled me. I was repelled by its eudaemonistic approach to religion, its valuation of prayer as the means by which a new industry could be established or a ball game won, and its humanistic interpretation of the kingdom of God. It speaks of a religion so coloured by the values of its environment that 'success' seems to become the chief end of man. And yet the author fascinated me by his cheerful optimism and by his skill in working in so many interesting real-life stories. Dr. Dunnington obviously knows a great deal about the technique of living.

In **Our Three Nations** (79 pp., Evans and Short, 2s. 6d.) members of Plaid Cymru, the Scottish National Party and Common Wealth have set out to show how Britain might be divided into a 'confraternity' of free and equal nations. Whilst agreeing that a larger measure of freedom from Whitehall control would benefit the countries of Britain, I doubt whether some of the assumptions on which this argument is founded are correct. The economics of the three countries are so interdependent that separation and the fostering of 'home' industries might well bring great strain between them.

The New Being. By Paul Tillich. 179 pp. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

This book contains 23 short sermons which were delivered mainly in American colleges and universities. There is nothing academic about them, however. Dr. Tillich speaks with simplicity and power to the needs of ordinary men and women. He sees the essential Christian message for our time as the appearance of the New Being in the coming of Jesus Christ. That New Being means Love, Freedom and Fulfilment. I was particularly struck with his sermon on " Principalities and Powers," with its strange yet convincing interpretation of the demonic forces which threaten man's soul, and its assertion of the power of God's love. The sermon on " The meaning of joy " is replete with wisdom and insight. I rarely find sermons of much interest. Too often they read like other men's insights served up cold. Tillich's sermons are different. Again and again he stops me and makes me reflect " I never saw it like this before." Here is a man who speaks with the authority which comes from living contact with God.

The Stumbling Block. By Francois Mauriac. 90 pp. Harvill. 9s. 6d.

This distinguished French novelist, a loyal son of the Roman Catholic Church, has written a most searching criticism of much that passes for religion among the faithful. He mercilessly uncovers " the mediocrity of the motives " of many who call themselves Christians, the snobbery that

exists in the Great Orders, and the carelessness about truth of many priests. Remembering his own youth he is particularly severe upon those who seek to use religion for a pleasurable experience. Mauriac's trenchant criticism is aimed at enabling Christians to see that it is the saints who make the Church strong. He pleads the world's need not of words but of examples. This book should cause Protestants as well as Catholics to look at their assumptions and practices with critical eyes. No one communion of the Church has a monopoly of cant and compromise. There are those in the Reformed Churches, too, who use pious forms of words as though they were incantations. Mauriac's clarity of thought and hatred of humbug cut through all religious pretentiousness.

Only One Way Left. By GEORGE MACLEOD. 165 pp. Iona Community. 10s. 6d.

Dr. MacLeod sees the need of the Church to make a new impact upon the common life of the day by a burning concern for social righteousness. He expresses the true prophetic insight when he says that it is in the contemporary situation that men must meet God. He is surely right when he criticizes so much of the activity of the Church as being irrelevant to man's need. Its teachings and preaching don't mean a thing to many people, because they do not appear to affect its own life. What Dr. MacLeod is pleading for is that the Church should take the Incarnation seriously. Its members must live out Christ's life amongst the affairs of the common man. In itself it must become a group like Alcoholics Anonymous whose members are ready to go to any lengths to try to save another member. Only the pietists would disagree with Dr. MacLeod's main contention. It is when the Church tries to be identified with the life of contemporary man that differences will arise as to the rightness of the path to be followed. For instance, not all will agree with Dr. MacLeod about the freedom which follows from large-scale planning. There is no doubt of the necessity to plan, but there is always the danger of losing individual character and initiative and of doing grave injustice. Despite its vulnerability to criticism at certain points and a certain roughness of form, this is a book which should be studied carefully by those who care about the presentation of the Gospel in the world today. It is prophetic in spirit, it breathes a deep concern and it tries hard to grapple with the Church's responsibility to embody the Gospel in contemporary life.

The Psalms in New Light. By W. E. FARNDALE. 116 pp. Epworth. 5s.

The " new light " is the scholarship of the last 50 years which has set the psalms against their background in the life and worship of Israel. Dr. Farndale performs a useful service for the general reader in making available to him information which is only to be found in commentaries which he is unlikely to read. In the last section of his book Dr. Farndale writes about " The psalms in relation to Jesus and His Followers." These short chapters are most interesting and valuable, and could with profit be much expanded. The man in the pew should find this book well worth reading.

I admire the light touch of T. Howard Crago in his book of addresses **The Road Winds up Hill** (Epworth, 7s. 6d.). He has a wonderful fund of stories upon which he draws freely for purposes of illustration.

Those who like bright and breezy addresses will appreciate **But Above All** by David N. Francis (Epworth, 6s.). I must confess to a dislike of

puns in sermons : " Whirled without End " is a bit too much to stomach as a title for an address.

The Salvation Army are putting out a series of booklets which will serve to remind their readers that the saving work still goes on. **After the Verdict** by John Wainwright (Salvationist Publishing Ltd. 6s. cloth, 3s. 6d. paper) shows that the courage and love of its workers remain unimpaired. The author tells the story of his work in British prisons and of the power of the Gospel to convert even hardened criminals.

Peace in Heaven and on Earth by William Robinson (Berean Press, 4s. 6d.) consists of lectures on Colossians and Ephesians delivered in North-West Christian College, Oregon. They are aimed at showing that the Church is not meant to be " a successful business corporation " but the Body of Christ. CHARLES HAIG.

By the Waters of Babylon. By JANET LACEY. 36 pp. Edinburgh House Press. 2s. 6d.

This is a moving little play about the suffering of refugees, specially written for the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches, and produced there with great effect. It is written in free verse form, and its dialogue is terse and economic and surprisingly evocative. The grey negativity of the refugee's life is pointed skilfully by the semi-stylised action and the severe settings, and by the costume (duffle-coats, grey flannels, neutral tone dresses). The play can be produced effectively in a church (there is no scenery nor a front curtain) and a useful and important note on lighting and production is included. This play is strongly recommended to all congregations. It is a sombre and haunting indictment of a contemporary world problem, and we would do well to heed its voice and examine our consciences.

The Healing Touch and **Torch in the Gloom** are two brief plays in the Fleet Drama Aids series (Independent Press, 1s.) Written by Frederick H. Wiseman they would make a useful introduction to religious drama for any congregation. The first is the better play, and tells the story of a supposed incident in the boyhood of Jesus. The dialogue is easy and natural and the note of breathless whimsey mercifully avoided. The pun in the last line is, I think, the one false note. The second is less successful, mainly because it tries to do too much in too short a period. It is a sort of potted history of Israel at the time of Hosea culminating in his decision to make public his prophetic writings. Mr. Wiseman has got some good ideas here, but has no space to develop them. I hope he will sit down and write a full-length play on this plot.

Also in the Fleet Drama Aids are three dramatized acts of worship by Robert Duce. **The Parable of the Great Feast** (Independent Press, 8d.) is the story in mime, music and narration of the well-known parable. **Unto Us a Child is Born** (Independent Press, 6d.) is a Christmas service with carols and a stylised little Nativity Play woven together. **God's Covenant** is a service built upon the theme of God's covenant with man in which the relevant scripture passages are fitted together and acted out before the congregation. This kind of drama is of course a development of the Sunday School Demonstration technique, and the inherent faults of that technique—the patchy dialogue, the rather strained situations—

are here to some extent. But this sort of service has an important part to play in that transition period when a congregation is moving towards an appreciation and understanding of religious drama in church. I think these are as good as they can be, and it is quite clear that they will 'play' well. They have the merit of incorporating large numbers of people (about 25) none of whom need have acting experience. This is their strength, and their obvious limitation. STUART JACKMAN.

Coral Island. Instructions for making model. By LILIAN PERRY. Independent Press. 2s. 6d.

Full instructions are provided for making a model of the coral island of Beru, complete with buildings, native huts, trees and people. The project is an ambitious one, and the finished model is 15 feet by 5 feet. It is planned as a group activity, but a leader would be needed who was good at this kind of thing. It would provide many hours of happy labour for a keen group, and the finished article would be imposing and instructive. The L.M.S. station of Rongorongo is on this island, and naturally features prominently in the model. The instructions are clear and detailed, and there is a useful appendix telling how to adapt the instructions for making smaller models and what to do if it is only desired to make a model of the mission station. This makes the project useful for individuals as well as for groups.

John Williams VI. Instructions for making model. By R. G. Avert. Independent Press. 2s.

Here are detailed instructions for making a wooden model of the John Williams VI. Some degree of ability in working with wood is assumed, and more skill is required than for the Coral Island model. Every practicable detail is given, and from careful hands would come a thrilling scale model of the missionary ship, about 10 inches long and 5 inches high.

The Friends Home Service Committee has published two useful booklets expounding their distinctive views on the claims of Jesus Christ and the Sacraments. One is by Frank Ward, **None Other Name,** 9d., and the other is by Maurice Creasey, **Sacraments,** 4d.

Immortality and You (Lindsey Press, 2s.) by Basil Viney treats the problem of survival from the Unitarian point of view.

In **The Travels and Letters of St. Paul** (Religious Education Press, 2s.) Canon C. J. Stranks has provided a concise introduction to a great subject.

Freedom and Education is the 1956 Beckley Lecture. It was delivered by John Christie and is published by the Epworth Press at 2s. 6d.

Letters on Pacifism reproduces a correspondence between John Ferguson and Ian Pitt-Watson on this thorny subject. Discursive but useful. Published by S.C.M. at 3s. 6d.

100 Hymns for Schools (O.U.P., 2s. 3d.) provides a really excellent selection. Most of the great hymns common to us all are included.

A. R. V.

MISCELLANEA

Winston Churchill on Jewish Problems. By Oskar K. Rabinowicz. 231 pp. Lincolns-Prager. 7s. 6d.

This is not as might be supposed a symposium of Churchill's speeches, but an account of his championship of the Jewish cause throughout his political career. It reveals his sympathy for the Jews as a consistent attitude which he never forsook even in the face of such provocation as the assassination of Lord Moyne in 1944 by two members of the Stern gang. Churchill was not only pro-Jewish, he was also a Zionist. Zionism appealed to him both as a statesman and as an historical romantic. The establishment of a Jewish state would not only provide a national home for Jews fleeing from persecution, but would also do justice to a people who had long suffered exile. Churchill first appeared in public life on the Jewish side in his opposition to the Aliens Bill of 1904. He was to return to the attack upon anti-Semitism again and again during his long career.

Why was Churchill, despite his high office, unable to do more to help the Jews when the Nazis were making their " attempt to exterminate a people " ? In the first place Churchill subordinated everything to the immediate aim of winning the war, and in the second place his humanity and idealism were checked by expediency and bureaucratic methods. The pro-Arab leanings of many leading Army officers was a further obstacle to the establishment of a viable Jewish state in Palestine. This is an interesting book. Does it perhaps portray Churchill as the friend of the Jews to encourage other friends at a time when Israel is closely beset by enemies ?

Charles Haig.

SBZ von 1945 bis 1954. The Soviet-occupied zone of Germany during the Years 1945-1954. 360 pp. Published by the Federal Ministry for All-German Affairs, Bonn. No price stated.

For those who wish to know what happened in the Russian Zone of Germany every day for nine years, this, provided they read German, is the book. It is, of course, impossible to read through, but it is nothing if not thorough. Every aspect of German life in the Russian zone is covered, and if you wish to know what happened on June 16, 1949, or December 3, 1952, or what happened in church and school, or anywhere else, all you have to do is to turn up the date in this vast historical calendar or look up the index. An irritating thing about it is the number of abbreviations—134 of them, which are all explained in an index. When, for example, we read that, on May 16, 1949, " according to information issued by the People's Council on March 6, 1949, the SED, CDU, LDP, NDP, DBD, FDGB, FDJ, and DFD have so participated in the list of candidates . . ." we are tempted to shout in protest ; but the index makes it all quite plain if we look up what these things mean.

There is a bewildering number of diagrams and maps. It is time, however, that people should cease speaking of the Russian Zone as if it only came as far as the Elbe. It reaches to within a couple of hours of the Rhine.

The Burning Tree. Poems from the first Thousand Years of Welsh Verse. Selected and translated by Gwyn Williams. 234 pp. Faber. 25s.

In this volume Professor Gwyn Williams has gathered nearly fifty

Welsh poems from the sixth to the early seventeenth centuries and, for the benefit of English readers who know no Welsh and Welsh readers who know little Old and Medieval Welsh, has translated them literally. Some of the finest are poems formerly attributed to Llywarch Hen, but now known to be anonymous. In pathos and economy of expression they compare with Anglo-Saxon elegiac poems such as *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, and the *Battle of Maldon*. There are three poems by Dafydd ap Gwilym, and only six by Dafydd ab Edmwnd, who was responsible for the high development of the technique of *cynghanedd*, a kind of pattern of internal alliteration of which I believe Gerard Manley Hopkins was the only practitioner in English. One of the loveliest poems in the book is Lewis Glyn Cothi's elegy on the death of his little son, and perhaps the most technically ingenious is the ode (*cywydd*) to the Porpoise by Archdeacon Edmwnd Prys (1544-1623), who also versified the Psalms in Welsh. Prof. Williams's anthology should be of interest to those who wish to know more about the non-English literature of Britain.

GERAINT V. JONES.

Fifty Years of Chinese Philosophy (1898-1950). By O. BRIERE. (Translated from the French by Laurence G. Thompson.) 159 pp. Allen & Unwin. 21s.

It is obviously impossible to understand and rightly evaluate the contemporary social and political history of China without being acquainted with the currents and cross-currents of philosophic thought lying behind that history. The importance of this present work is that it is the first to survey the philosophical history and literature of China during the last fifty years. Père Brière was formerly on the staff of the Aurora University of Shanghai, and was released by the Communists only in 1953. He has spent his life in the study of Chinese philosophy, religion and sociology.

This book gives us a remarkable and obviously authentic insight into modern Chinese intellectualism. During the first quarter century there was the interplay of Western philosophical and scientific thought with traditional Chinese conservatism. Since 1927, the 'Orientalists' attempted to remain faithful to the national traditional philosophy as a whole, modifying it in the light of Western ideas, but holding fast to the Confucian emphasis on ethics. The 'Occidentalists' however were on the rising tide. They made a complete break with tradition, using the older elements of thought only to buttress a newer materialism of science and sociology in line with Marxist socialism.

There is an important representative Bibliography of Authors and Principal Works of the last fifty years. This book gives us the first glimpse of the complex intellectual ferment in modern China.

H. V. MARTIN.

The Story of Mary Liu. By EDWARD HUNTER. 248 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

Mary Liu was an orphan who, while still a child, lost both her hands and both her feet through frost-bite. She was adopted by American missionaries, brought up by them and educated in Shanghai. Naturally gifted, mentally and morally, she so far triumphed over her disadvantages as to become editor of *The Woman's Messenger*, a periodical published by the Christian Literature Society. The bulk of her story is taken up with an account of Communist attempts to eliminate the influence of Christianity

in China, and of Miss Liu's struggles " to escape the trap which was making religion in China—any religion : Protestant, Catholic, Buddhist and Moslem —a political medium for the destruction both of itself and the basic human decencies."

Readers with a taste for Biblical fiction and a highly-coloured and archaic English prose style will not be disappointed by Mrs Gladys Zehnpfennig's **Search for Eden** (The World's Work, Kingswood, Surrey, 15s.). This tells the story of Noah and his people and of their relations with the Itonites and the Itonite women, "who (to quote the jacket) are provocatively characteristic of the temptresses who crimson the pages of history and literature."

Mr. John Hoffman's **The Search** (Guild Press, Crayke, York, 3s. 6d.) contains some twenty poems in praise of God and of married love. In such pieces as 'Waiting' and 'The Flowerseller' these themes are interwoven in a way which reminds one of that little-read and much underrated Victorian poet, Coventry Patmore.

In **From a Hilltop** (Epworth Press, 7s. 6d.) Miss Rita F. Snowden tells how she and a friend built a house and set up a new home. From the clearance of the site to the choosing of the curtains we follow her course which, like that of true love, did not run smooth. Miss Snowden is a practised writer, as her intimate style and a long list of titles " By the same author " show. In the course of this short book we wander far from house-building : religion, music, authorship, public-speaking and the flora of New Zealand are among the subjects touched on.

The Winter's Tale (O.U.P., 7s.), edited by Mr. S. L. Bethell, is the latest addition to the *New Clarendon* Shakespeare. Intended primarily for the beginner, this edition can be used with profit by advanced students and by all unprofessional lovers of the play. The most interesting part of the editor's introduction is his attempt to elucidate the play's inner meaning, an analysis which may convince some readers that " Shakespeare's mature interpretation of life is that of the Christian faith." Besides a complete text, notes and illustrations, there is a valuable terminal section, running to nearly 30 pages, of literary criticism of the play.

P. A. Spalding.

Games for the Not-So-Young (Methuen, 10s. 6d.) adds yet another to the long list of games books by Sid G. Hedges. Well over 100 games are described, some old favourites, but some will be new to most readers.

The Congregational Diary for 1957 (Independent Press, 5s.) provides just what the average minister requires : good day-to-day space for engagements, an advance section for 1958, the general information that any good diary provides, and much helpful matter on denominational affairs. There are also road and underground railway maps. Laymen will find it equally useful, and excellent value. It is strongly bound in blue, green or maroon.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (October) includes 'Wisdom and Intelligence' by an anonymous writer; 'Poetry and Poverty in the Ancient World' by A. N. Marlow; 'Philosophers and Techniques' by Dr. Ed. Conze; 'The Effect of Technology on Man' by Leslie Paul; 'Work in Western Civilization' by Capt. Anthony Ludovici; 'The Christian Significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls' by M. Chaning-Pearce; 'An Independent African Church in Sierra Leone' by Dr. M. Banton; 'A Communist View of the Reformation' by R. C. Andrews; 'Three Studies in Comparative Religion' by Prof. S. G. F. Brandon.

International Review of Missions (October) includes 'Theological Education in Africa' by Rev. Paul D. Fueter; 'Training the Ministry in S. & S.E. Asia' by Prof. Wm. Stewart; 'A New Pattern of the Church in India' by Rev. E. Priestley; 'The Support of the Clergy in the First Five Centuries' by Rev. W. G. B. Ream; a review article by Rev. Robert Smith on F. Lovsky's *Antisemitisme et Mystere d'Israel.*

Scottish Journal of Theology (September) includes 'John Baillie, A Lyrical Tribute & Appraisal' by Dr. John A. Mackay; 'The Architecture of Barth's Church Dogmatics' by John Godsey; 'On the Anniversaries of Mozart, Kierkegaard & Barth' by Arthur C. Cochrane; 'The Relevance of Biblical Justice to Industry'; 'Considerations on the Definition of a Sacrament' by Rev. J. C. Campbell.

London Quarterly & Holborn Review (October) includes six papers on 'Christianity and Education'; and a tribute by Dr. Marcus Ward to the late Dr. Charles Ryder Smith who is succeeded as Review Editor by Dr. R. Newton Smith.

Friends' Quarterly (October) in an interesting number includes 'George Fox's Conception of the Church' by Lewis Benson; 'On the Essence of Relationship' by Henriette Jordan; 'Through Fiction to Reality' by Reginald A. Smith; 'Displaced Persons—or Human Beings' by Eileen M. Taylor.

Evangelical Quarterly (October-December) has 'Christianity and Social Problems' by Rev. F. S. Leahy; 'Brethren Hymnology' by John S. Andrews; 'Assurance' by Alan R. Rogers.

Theology (August) includes 'Toleration' by Preb. A. E. Baker; 'A Literary Note' by C. H. Sisson; a letter from Dr. E. L. Mascall on 'Theological Verbosity'. (September) 'Buddhism Today: Its Appeal to Modern Man' by Rev. G. F. S. Gray; 'A Religious Best-Seller' (Daniel-Rops, *Jesus in His Time*) by Montgomery Belgion. (October) 'Training Doves' by Canon A. R. Vidler, an account of the ministerial training of elderly candidates for ordination.

Expository Times (September) includes 'The Christian View of Nature' by Rev. W. David Stacey; 'The Nature Miracles' by Dr. Wm. Neil. (October) 'Demonology and the Classic Idea of Atonement' by Dr. J. Macquarrie; 'The Virgin Birth' by Prof. H. E. W. Turner.

Theology Today (October) is devoted entirely, except for a few pages of book reviews, to articles about Karl Barth, as "a modest, somewhat belated, but respectful American tribute" to the great theologian, who celebrated his seventieth birthday on May 10, 1956. As well as other articles, twelve distinguished theologians write under the heading 'How Barth has influenced me.' It is a noteworthy number.

Yale Review (Autumn) includes 'Strategy versus Ideology', a most timely discussion, by Louis J. Halle; 'The First Psychoanalyst' by Erik H. Erikson; 'Conservative Economic Policy' by Prof. H. C. Wallich; 'Austria Today' by H. S. Benjamin.

Harvard Theological Review (July) includes 'The Authorship of Egerton Papyrus No. 3' by Henry Chadwick; 'Heracles Thasios' by F. Sokolowski; 'The Gothic Evidence for "Euthalian Matter"' by James W. Marchand; 'An Ordinance against Images in Jerusalem, A.D. 66' by Cecil Both.

J. M. P.